



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. 51] नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, दिसम्बर 17, 1994/अग्रहायण 26, 1916
No. 51] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1994/AGRAHAYANA 26, 1916

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में
रखा जा सके

Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a
separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii) PART II—Section 3—Sub-Section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएँ
Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence)

विधि, न्याय और कम्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय

MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY

सूचना

AFFAIRS

NOTICE

नई दिल्ली, 7 नवम्बर, 1994

New Delhi, the 7th November, 1994

का.ग्रा. 3466.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के
अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है
कि श्री राम किशोर चौहान, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी
को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन उस
बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे मिथाना (उत्तर प्रदेश) में
व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी
भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन
के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

S.O. 3466.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent
Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956
that application has been made to the said Authority, under
Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Ram Kishore Chauhan,
Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Siyana
(U.P.).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person
as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned
within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[सं. एफ. 5(157)/94-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

[No. F. 5(157)/94-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 10 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3467.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री रेवती प्रसाद अग्रवाल, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे करौली (राजस्थान) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(164)/94-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 10th November, 1994

S.O. 3467.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Rawati Prasad Agarwal, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Karauli (Rajasthan).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(164)/94-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 10 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3468.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री ललित कुमार एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे वेस्ट पटेल नगर, राष्ट्रीय राजधानी दिल्ली में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(166)/94-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 10th November, 1994

S.O. 3468.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Lalit Kumar Advocate, for appointment as a Notary to practise in West Patel Nagar, NCT of Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(166)/94-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent, Authority

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 10 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3469.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री एम.आर. भारद्वाज, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे साऊथ दिल्ली, राष्ट्रीय राजधानी क्षेत्र दिल्ली में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(167)/94-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 10th November, 1994

S.O. 3469.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri M.R. Bhardwaj, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in South Delhi, NCT of Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(167)/94-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

सूचना

नई दिल्ली 10 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3470.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री वलजीत सिंह सैनी, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे रोपड़ जिला (पंजाब) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

(सं. एफ. 5(168)/94-न्यायिक)

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 10th November, 1994

S.O. 3470.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Daljit Singh Saini, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Ropar Distt. (Punjab).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(168)/94-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent, Authority

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 10 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3471.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री प्रमोद सी. शर्मा, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे पुणे (महाराष्ट्र) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[स.एफ. 5(165)/94-न्यायिक]
पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 10th November, 1994

S.O. 3471.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Pramod C. Sharma, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Pune (Maharashtra).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(165)/94-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 10 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3472.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्रीमती अनीता वी. केवलरामानी एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे चेम्बूर, बम्बई (महाराष्ट्र) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[स. एफ. 5(163)/94-न्यायिक]
पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 10th November, 1994

S.O. 3472.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Smt. Anita V. Kevalramani, Advocate, for appointment as a Notary to practise in Chambur, Bombay, (Maharashtra).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(163)/94-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 15 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3473.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री सत्य प्रकाश शर्मा, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे तीस हजारि कोर्ट (राष्ट्रीय राजधानी क्षेत्र, दिल्ली) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[स. एफ. 5(173)/94-न्यायिक]
पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 15th November, 1994

S.O. 3473.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Satya Prakash Sharma, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Tis Hazari Courts, (NCT of Delhi).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(173)/94-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 15 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3474.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री ए.आर. माधव राव, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे सफदरजंग एनक्लेव (राष्ट्रीय राजधानी दिल्ली क्षेत्र) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[स. एफ. 5(172)/94-न्यायिक]
पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 15th November, 1994

S.O. 3474.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri A. R. Madhav Rao, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Safdarjang Enclave, NCT of Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(172)/94 Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 15 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3475.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री जगबीर सिंह, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे फरीदाबाद (हरियाणा) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(174)/94-न्यायिक]
पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 15th November, 1994

S.O. 3475.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Jagbir Singh, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Faridabad (Haryana).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(174)/94-Judl.]
P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 15 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3476.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री सुरेन्द्र सिंह एम. परमार, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे दादरा एवं नगरहवेली में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(171)/94-न्यायिक]
पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 15th November, 1994

S.O. 3476.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Surendrasingh M. Parmar, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise Dadra & Nagar Haveli (U.T.).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(171)/94 Judl.]
P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 15 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3477.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री कमल कान्त मिश्रा, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे इलाहाबाद डिस्ट्रिक्ट कोर्ट में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(170)/94-न्यायिक]
पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 15th November, 1994

S.O. 3477.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Kamal Kant Misra, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Allahabad Distt. Court (U.P.).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(170)/94-Judl.]
P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 21 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3478.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री तपन कुमार डे, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे बीरभूम जिला (पश्चिम बंगाल) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. एफ. 5(175)/94-न्यायिक]
पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 21st November, 1994

S.O. 3478.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Tapan Kumar Dey, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Birbhoon Distt. (West Bengal).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(175)/94 Judl.]
P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 21 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3479.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री दिनेश प्रसाद शर्मा, एडवोकेट के उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे वाराणसी (उत्तर प्रदेश) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं.एफ 5(178)/94-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 21st November, 1994

S.O. 3479.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Dinesh Prasad Sharma, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Varanasi (U.P.).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(178)/94 Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 28 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3480.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री तुषार सी. पोपट, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे मुलुंद (वैस्ट) बम्बई (महाराष्ट्र) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं.एफ 5(179)/94-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 28th November, 1994

S.O. 3480.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Tushar C. Popat, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Mulund (West) Bombay (Maharashtra).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

... [No. F. 5(179)/94 Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 28 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3481.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री पवन चौधरी, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे मानसरोवर गार्डन, राष्ट्रीय राजधानी दिल्ली में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं.एफ 5(176)/94-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 28th November, 1994

S.O. 3481.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Pawan Chaudhary, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Mansarovar Garden, NCT of Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(176)/94-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 28 नवम्बर 1994

का.आ. 3482.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री डी. मोहदीन, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे जयनगर, बंगलूर (कर्नाटक) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं.एफ 5(177)/94-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन्, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 28th November, 1994

S.O. 3482.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri D. Mahadin, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Jayanagar, Bangalore (Karnataka).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(177)/94-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority.

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत तथा पेंशन मंत्रालय

(कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 29 नवम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3483.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दण्ड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री रविन्द्र नाथ बल्ला, लोक अभियोजक, केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो, विशाखापट्टनम, को भारत के ऐसे किसी राज्य या संघ राज्य क्षेत्र में, जिसको पूर्वोक्त धारा के उपबन्ध लागू होते हैं, विधि द्वारा स्थापित विचारण न्यायालयों में दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन द्वारा संस्थित मामलों का और पुनरीक्षण या अपील न्यायालयों में इस मामलों में उद्भूत अपीलों, पुनरीक्षणों या अन्य विषयों के संचालन के लिए विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या: 225/47/94-ए.बी.डी. (ii)1]

आर. एम. विष्ट, प्रवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES
AND PENSIONS

(Department of Personnel & Training)

New Delhi, the 29th November, 1994

S.O. 3483.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of Section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Act No. 2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints of Shri Ravindranath Balla, Public Prosecutor, Central Bureau of Investigation, Visakhapatnam as Special Public Prosecutor for the conduct of cases instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment in Trial Courts and Appeals, revisions or other matters arising out of the cases in revisional or appellate Courts, established by law in any State or Union Territory to which the provisions of the aforesaid Section apply.

[No. 225/47/94-AVD.II]

R. S. BISHT, Under Secy

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 5 दिसम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3484.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम 25 की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, पुलिस स्टेशन वैचिउर, थिरुवन्थापुर, केरल के अन्तर्गत रजिस्टर किए गए मामला संख्या 246/94 दिनांक 13-11-1994 के बाबत धारा 3, 4 और 5 आफिशियल सीक्रेट्स ऐक्ट 1923, 120 ए, 120 बी तथा 34 भारतीय दंड संहिता के अधीन दण्डनीय अपराधों और उक्त अपराधों और उन्हीं तथ्यों से उत्पन्न होने वाले वैसे ही संव्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किए गए किसी अन्य अपराधों के संबंध में या उनमें संसक्त प्रयत्नों, दुष्प्रणियों और षड्यंत्रों के अन्वेषण के लिए केरल सरकार की सहमति से दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तारण संपूर्ण केरल राज्य पर करती है।

[संख्या 228/59/94-ए.बी.डी. II-(i)]

आर. एम. विष्ट, प्रवर सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 5th December, 1994

S.O. 3484.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of Section 5, read with Section 6, of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act No. 25 of 1946) the Central Government, with the consent of the State Government of Kerala hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of State of Kerala for the investigation of offences punishable U/s. 3, 4 & 5 of the Official Secrets Act, 1923, 120-A, 120-B, 34 of Indian Penal Code and any other offences, attempts, abetments and conspiracies in relation to or in connection with the said offences and any other offences committed in the course of same transaction or arising out of the same fact or facts in regard to FIR Case No. 246/94 dated 13-11-1994 of PS Vanchiyoor, Thiruvanthapuram., Kerala regarding spying, illegal communication of secret informations and conspiracy to under-mine the security of the country.

[No. 228/59/94-AVD-II (i)]

R. S. BISHT, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 5 दिसम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3485.—केन्द्रीय सरकार दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए पुलिस स्टेशन वैचिउर, थिरुवन्थापुरम, केरल के अन्तर्गत रजिस्टर किए गए मामला संख्या 225/94 दिनांक 20-10-1994 के बाबत फार्नरस आर्डर 1948 के पैरा 7 और फार्नरस ऐक्ट 1966 की धारा 14 के तहत दण्डनीय अपराधों और उक्त अपराधों और उन्हीं तथ्यों से उत्पन्न होने वाले वैसे ही संव्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किए गए किसी अन्य अपराधों के संबंध में या उनमें संसक्त प्रयत्नों, दुष्प्रणियों और षड्यंत्रों के अन्वेषण के लिए केरल सरकार की सहमति से दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तारण संपूर्ण केरल राज्य पर करती है।

[संख्या 228/59/94-ए.बी.डी.-II(ii)]

आर. एस. विष्ट, प्रवर सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 5th December, 1994

S.O. 3485.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of Section 5, read with Section 6, of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act No. 25 of 1946) the Central Government, with the consent of the State Government of Kerala hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of State of Kerala for the investigation of offences punishable under para 7 of Foreigners Order, 1948 and Section 14 of the Foreigners Act, 1946 and any other offences, attempts, abetments and conspiracies in relation to or in connection with the said offences

and any other offences committed in the course of same transaction or arising out of the same fact or facts in regard to FIR case No. 225/94 dated 20-10-1994 of P3 Venchiyoor, Thiruvanthapuram, Kerala.

[No. 228/59/94-AVD-II (ii)]
R. S. BISHT, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 6 दिसम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3486--आतंकवादी एवं विद्युतनकारी गतिविधियों (निवारण) अधिनियम, 1987 (1987 का 28) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (i) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत की गई, के. सक्सेना, उप विधि सलाहकार, केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो विशेष अन्वेषण कक्ष-2, नई दिल्ली को केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो द्वारा अन्वेषित मामलों अथवा उनके साथ चटित अन्य मामलों को गठित नामित न्यायालय, कानपुर में संचालित करने के लिए विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या 225/42/94 ए. बी. डी. II)]
आर. एस. बिष्ट, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 6th December, 1994

S.O. 3486.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of section 13 of the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act, 1987, (28 of 1987), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Y. K. Saxena, Deputy Legal Adviser, Central Bureau of Investigation, New Delhi, as a Special Public Prosecutor, for conducting cases and other matters connected therewith or incidental thereto under the said Act investigated or instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment in the Designated Court at Kanpur constituted under section 9 of the aforesaid Act.

[No. 225/42/94-AVD.-II]
R. S. BISHT, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय
(राजस्व विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 नवम्बर, 1994

स्टाम्प

का.आ. 3487.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा उस शुल्क को माफ करती है जो राष्ट्रीय आवास बैंक, नई दिल्ली द्वारा जारी किए जाने वाले मात्र चालीस करोड़ रुपये के (चालीस करोड़ रुपये) मूल्य के 13.50 प्रतिशत-10 वर्षीय राष्ट्रीय आवास बैंक बाण्डों (छठी श्रृंखला) के रूप में वर्णित प्रोमिसरी नोटों के स्वरूप के बाण्डों पर उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत प्रभावी है।

[सं. 34/94-स्टाम्प-का. सं. 33/31/94-बि.क.]

आत्मा राम, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd November, 1994

STAMPS

S.O. 3487.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits the duty with which the bonds in the nature of Promissory Notes—described as 13.50 per cent—10 years National Housing Bank Bonds (Sixth Series) of the value of rupees Forty Crores (40 crores) only to be issued by National Housing Bank, New Delhi are chargeable under the said Act.

[No. 34/94-Stamp-F. No. 33/31/94-ST]

ATMA RAM, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 नवम्बर, 1994

स्टाम्प

का.आ. 3488.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (i) के खण्ड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा गुजरात इंडस्ट्रियल इन्वर्स्टमेंट कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, अहमदाबाद को केवल एक लाख बारह हजार और पांच सौ रुपये का समेकित स्टाम्प शुल्क अदा करने की अनुमति देती है, जो कि उक्त निगम द्वारा जारी किए जाने वाले मात्र एक करोड़ पचास लाख रुपये के कुल मूल्य के प्रत्येक एक-एक लाख रुपये के अंकित मूल्य के श्रृंखला के 1 से 15,000 तक की विशिष्ट संख्या वाले 27वीं श्रृंखला के 13.5 % जी.आई.आई.सी. बाण्डों पर उक्त स्टाम्प/शुल्क के कारण प्रभावी है।

[सं. 33/94-स्टाम्प/का. सं. 33/66/94-बि.क.]

आत्मा राम, अवर सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd November, 1994

STAMPS

S.O. 3488.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby permits the Gujarat Industrial Investment Corporation Limited, Ahmedabad to pay consolidated stamp duty of rupees One lakh twelve thousand and five hundred only, chargeable on account of the stamp duty on 13.5 per cent G.I.C. Bonds, 27th Series bearing distinctive numbers 1 to 15,000 in the form of debentures of the face value of rupees One lakh each of the aggregate value of rupees One crore fifty lakhs only to be issued by the said Corporation.

[No. 33/94-Stamp-F. No. 33/66/94-ST.]

ATMA RAM, Under Secy.

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 24 नवम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3489.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970 के खण्ड 5 के उपखण्ड (1), खण्ड 7 और खण्ड 8 के उपखण्ड (1) के साथ पठित खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (क) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के साथ परामर्श करने के पश्चात् एतद्वारा पंजाब नेशनल बैंक के वर्तमान कार्यपालक निदेशक श्री हरभजन सिंह को 1 दिसम्बर, 1994 से 30 नवम्बर, 1999 तक की अवधि के लिए इलाहाबाद बैंक के अध्यक्ष एवं प्रबंध निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं. एफ. 9/12/94-बी.ओ. I]

के. के. मंगल, अवर सचिव

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 24th November, 1994

S.O. 3489.—In pursuance of sub-clause (a) of clause 3 read with sub-clause (1) of clause 5, clause 7 and sub-clause (1) of clause 8 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970, the Central Government, after consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby appoints Shri Harbhajan Singh, presently Executive Director, Punjab National Bank as the Chairman and Managing Director, Allahabad Bank for the period from 1st December, 1994 and upto 30th November, 1999.

[F. No. 9/12/94-BO.I]

K. K. MANGAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 30 नवम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3490.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970 के खण्ड 3 के उप खण्ड (ज) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, नीचे दी गयी सारणी के कालम (2) में निर्दिष्ट व्यक्तियों को उक्त सारणी के कालम (3) में निर्दिष्ट व्यक्तियों के स्थान पर कालम (1) में निर्दिष्ट राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंकों को निदेशक नियुक्त करती है :—

सारणी

1	2	3
1. बैंक ऑफ इंडिया	श्री डी. आर. एस. चौधरी, निदेशक, वित्त मंत्रालय, आर्थिक कार्य विभाग (बैंकिंग प्रभाग) नई दिल्ली	श्रीमती राजलक्ष्मी
2. यूनिन बैंक ऑफ कु. पी. बोलिना, इंडिया	उप सचिव, वित्त मंत्रालय, आर्थिक कार्य विभाग, (बैंकिंग प्रभाग), नई दिल्ली।	श्री डी. आर. एस. चौधरी

[सं. एफ. 9/9/94-बी.ओ.]

के. के. मंगल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 30th November, 1994

S. O. 3490:—In pursuance of sub-clause (h) of clause 3 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970, the Central Government hereby appoints the persons specified in column (2) of the Table below as Directors of the nationalised banks specified in column (1) thereof in place of the persons specified in column (3) of the said Table :—

TABLE

(1)	(2)	(3)
Bank of India	Sh. D.R.S. Chaudhary, Director, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs (Banking Division), New Delhi.	Smt. Rajalakshmi
Union Bank of India	Miss P. Bolina, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs (Banking Division) New Delhi.	Sh. D.R.S. Chaudhary

[No. F. 9/9/94-B.O.I.]

K.K. MANGAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 1 दिसम्बर, 1994

का.ग्रा. 3491.—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 3 की उप धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा, इस विभाग की दिनांक 10 दिसम्बर, 1979 की अधिमूचना संख्या 1—4/77-आर.आर.बी. (1) और दिनांक 11 मई, 1992 के पश्चात्तर्ती अधिमूचना सं. 7/32/90-आर.आर.बी. में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है :—

उपर्युक्त अधिमूचना में “श्रीनगर, बड़गांव, अनंतनाग और पुलवामा, उधमपुर और डोडा जिलों शब्दों के स्थान पर “श्रीनगर, बड़गांव, अनंतनाग, पुलवामा, उधमपुर, डोडा और जम्मू जिले शब्द रख जाएंगे।

[सं. एफ. 7/11/94-आर.आर.बी.]

सी. बी. प्रसाद, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 1st December, 1994

S.O. 3491.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 3 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in this Department's Notifications No. F. 1/(4)/7/RRB(I) dated 10th September, 1979 and subsequent Notification No. F. 7/(32)/90-RRB dated 11th May, 1992, namely:—

In the said notification, for the words “districts of Srinagar, Badgam, Anantnag, Pulwama, Udhampur and Doda”, the words “districts of Srinagar, Badgam, Anantnag, Pulwama, Udhampur, Doda and Jammu” shall be substituted.

[No. F. 7/(11)/94/RRB.]

C. B. PRASAD, Under Secy.

विदेश मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 23 नवम्बर, 1994

का. ग्रा. 3492.—राजनयिक कौंसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवम, शुल्क) अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 41वां) की धारा 2 के अंक (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत का उच्चायोग सिंगापुर में सहायक श्री मुकेश मोहन को 22-8-94 कोंसली एजेंट का कार्य करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[सं. टी -4330 /1/94]

ओस्कर केरकेट्टा, अवर सचिव (कौंसली)

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 23rd November, 1994

3492.—In pursuance of the Clause ‘A’ of the Section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers, (Oath and Fees) Act, 1947 (41 of 1948) the Central Government hereby authorises Shri Mukesh Mohan, Assistant in the High Commission of India, Singapore to perform the duties of Consular Agent with effect from 22-8-1994.

[No. T-4330/1/94]

OSCAR KERKETTA, Under Secy. (Cons.)

2734 GI/94—2

नई दिल्ली, 23 नवम्बर, 1994

का. ग्रा. 3493.—राजनयिक कौंसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवम शुल्क) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 41वां) की धारा 2 के अंक (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत का मुख्य कौंसला वाम हो ची मिन्ह में श्री धीराज कठ्याल पी ए को 25-10-94 से कौंसली एजेंट का कार्य करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है :

[सं. टी -4330/1 /94]

ओस्कर केरकेट्टा अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd November, 1994

S.O. 3493.—In pursuance of the Clause ‘A’ of the Section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oath and Fees) Act 1948 (41 of 1948), the Central Government hereby authorises Shri Dhiraj Katyal, P.A. in the Consulate General of India Ho Chi Minh City to perform the duties of Consular Agent with effect from 25-10-1994.

[No. T. 4330/1/94]

OSCAR KERKETTA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 नवम्बर, 1994

का. ग्रा. 3494 राजनयिक कौंसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवम शुल्क) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 41वां) की धारा 2 के अंक (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत का दूतावास वियाना में सहायक श्री जामकी दास और वी. आर. वासदेव को 10-8-94 से कौंसली एजेंट का कार्य करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[संख्या टी-4330 /1 /94]

ओस्कर केरकेट्टा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd November, 1994

S.O. 3494.—In pursuance of the Clause ‘A’ of the Section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oath and Fees) Act, 1948 (41 of 1948), the Central Government hereby authorises Sh. Janki Das, Asstt; and Sh. V. R. Vasdev Asstt; in the Embassy of India Vienna to perform the duties of Consular Agents with effect from 10-8-94.

[No. T. 4330/1/94]

OSCAR KERKETTA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 नवम्बर, 1994

का. ग्रा. 3495.—राजनयिक कौंसली (अधिकारी (शपथ एवम शुल्क) अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 41वां) की धारा 2 के अंक (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत का उच्चायोग लावोग से सहायक श्री अनिल सक्सेना को 10-8-94 से कौंसली एजेंट का कार्य करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[सं. टी -4330 /1 /94]

ओस्कर केरकेट्टा अवर सचिव (कौंसली)

New Delhi, the 23rd November, 1994

S.O. 3495.—In pursuance of the Clause 'A' of the Section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oath and Fees) Act 1948 (41 of 1948), the Central Government hereby authorises Sh. Anil Saxena, Assistant in the High Commission of India Lagos of perform the duties of Consular Agent with effect from 10-8-94.

[No. T. 4330/1/94]

OSCAR KERKETTA, Under Secy

नई दिल्ली, 23 नवम्बर 1994

का. आ. 3496—राजनयिक कौमन्ती अधिकारी (शपथ) एवम् शुल्क) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 41वां) की धारा 2 के अंक (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा भारत का दूतावास बर्न में सहायक श्री टी के मिश्रा को 9-8-94 से कौमन्ती एजेंट का कार्य करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[सं. टी /4330 /1 /94]

ओस्कर केरकेट्टा अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd November, 1994

S.O. 3496. In pursuance of the Clause 'A' of the section 2 of the Diplomatic and consular officers (Oath and Fees) Act 1948 (41 of 1948), the Central Government hereby authorises Sh. T. K. Mishra, Assistant in the Embassy of India Berne, to perform the duties of Consular Agent with effect from 9-8-84.

[No. T. 4330/1/94]

OSCAR KERKETTA, Under Secy.

वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

विदेश व्यापार महानिदेशालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 17 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3497.—मै. विरल लेमिनेट्स प्रा. लि., अहमदाबाद को पूंजीगत माल (औद्योगिक और प्लास्टिक की लेमिनेट्स शीट) आयात के लिए 1,76,207/- रुपये (एक लाख छियात्तर हजार दो सौ सात रुपये) का एक आयात लाइसेंस स. पी./सी जी/2135135 दिनांक 14-2-94 प्रदान किया गया था।

2. फर्म ने उक्त मूल लाइसेंस खोने अथवा गम हो जाने के आधार पर उपरोक्त लाइसेंस की दूसरी प्रति लेने के लिए आवेदन नहीं किया है। आगे यह कहा गया है कि लाइसेंस किसी भी सीमाशुल्क प्राधिकारी के पास पंजीकृत नहीं था और उसका इस्तेमाल बिल्कुल नहीं किया गया। अतः इसकी अप्रयुक्त राशि 1,76,207/ रुपये शेष है।

3. अपने दावे की पुष्टि के लिए लाइसेंसधारी ने शपथ पत्र पर नोटरी पब्लिक के समक्ष शपथ लेकर हलफनामा प्रस्तुत किया है। मैं इस बात से सहमत हूँ कि आयात लाइसेंस सं. पी/सी जी/2135135 दिनांक 14-2-94 फर्म में खो गया है अथवा स्थान उधर हो गया है। यथा संशोधित, आयात नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 दिनांक 7-12-55 की उपधारा 9(ग ग) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मै. विरल लेमिनेट्स प्रा. लि., अहमदाबाद का मूल आयात लाइसेंस स. पी/सी जी/2135135 दिनांक 14-2-94 रद्द किया जाता है।

[फाइल नं. 18/710/ए एम-94/ई पी सी जी-3/6447 सं.]

माया देवी केम, उप महानिदेशक विदेश व्यापार

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Office of Directorate General of Foreign Trade)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 17th November, 1994

S.O. 3497.—M/s. Viral Laminates Pvt. Ltd., Ahmedabad were granted an import licence No. P/CG/2135135 dated 14-2-94 for Rs. 1,76,207 (Rupees One Lakh Seventy Six Thousand Two Hundred and Seven only) for import of capital goods (Decorative and Industrial Plastic Laminated Sheets).

2. The firm has not applied for issue of duplicate copies of the above mentioned licence on the ground that the original licence has been lost & misplaced. It has further been stated that the licence was not registered with any customs authorities and has been utilised for a sum of Rs. Nil leaving an unutilised balance of Rs. 1,76,207.

3. In support of their contention, the licensee has filed an Affidavit on stamped paper duly sworn in before Notary Public, Ahmedabad. I am accordingly satisfied that the import licence No. P/CG/2135135, dated 14-2-94 has been lost or misplaced by the firm. In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-clause 9(cc) of the import (control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-55 as amended, the said original Import Licence No. P/CG/2135135 dated 14-2-94 issued to M/s. Viral Laminates Pvt. Ltd., Ahmedabad, is hereby cancelled.

[F. No. 18/710/AM-94/EPCG-III/6447]

MAYA D. KEM, Dy. Director General of Foreign Trade

कोयला मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 24 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3498—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई और भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii), तारीख 1 फरवरी 1992 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना स. का.आ. 371, तारीख 8 जनवरी, 1992 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संबन्धित अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट परिक्षेत्र में भूमि अर्जित करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का पूर्वोक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और पश्चिमी बंगाल सरकार से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि इसमें संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित (उपखंड "क", "ख", "ग", "घ" और "ङ") 540.00 एकड़ (लगभग) या 218.60 हेक्टर (लगभग) माप वाली भूमि अर्जित की जानी चाहिए;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित 540.00 एकड़ (लगभग) या 218.60 हेक्टर (लगभग) माप वाली भूमि अर्जित की जाती है।

इस अधिसूचना के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक सं. ई.सी.एल./जे.एन.आर./एल.ए./89/18, तारीख 25 अक्तूबर, 1989 का निरीक्षण, कनकट, बर्दमान (पश्चिमी बंगाल) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता के कार्यालय में या निदेशक (तकनीकी), ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, सेंकटोरिया, डाफवर दिग्गढ़, जिला बर्दमान (पश्चिमी बंगाल) के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

अनुसूची

गनीगज खंड-XI विस्तार

रानीखंड—कोयला क्षेत्र

(अर्जित की गई भूमि दर्शित करते हुए रेखांक सं. ई.सी.एल./जे.एन.आर./एल.ए./89/18, तारीख 25 अक्तूबर, 1989)

उपखंड-क

सभी अधिकार

क्र. सं.	मौजा (ग्राम)	थाना सं. (अधिकारिता सूची सं.)	पुनर्निर्धारित थाना	जिला	क्षेत्र एकड़ों में	टिप्पणियाँ
1.	बैनेबन्धी	11	लौडोहा में फरीदपुर	बर्दमान	9.00	भाग
2.	बालीजुरि	16	लौडोहा में फरीदपुर	बर्दमान	110.00	भाग
3.	मधईगंज	24	लौडोहा में फरीदपुर	बर्दमान	0.90	भाग

कुल : —119.90 एकड़ (लगभग)

या

48.54 हेक्टर (लगभग)

मौजा बैनेबन्धी में अर्जित किए गए प्लॉट संख्यांक :

145 (भाग), 180 (भाग), 183 (भाग), 184, 185, 186 (भाग)।

मौजा बालीजुरि में अर्जित किए गए प्लॉट संख्यांक :

342 (भाग), 343, 347, 352 (भाग), 353 (भाग), 354 से 414, 354/2086, 377/2071, 415 (भाग), 416 (भाग), 417, 418 (भाग), 422, 427, 1501 से 1503, 1504 (भाग), 1505 से 1508, 1509 (भाग), 1525 (भाग), 1526, 1536 से 1543, 1549 (भाग), 1551 (भाग), 1552 (भाग), 1553 से 1587 (भाग), 1588 (भाग), 1590, 1592 (भाग), 1598 (भाग), 1600 से 1604, 1605 (भाग), 1606 (भाग), 1625 (भाग), 1628 से 1637, 1638 (भाग), 1639, 1640 (भाग), 1721 (भाग), 1724 से 1741, 1742 (भाग), 1599 (भाग), 404/2117, 1501/2105, 1574/2137.

मौजा मधईगंज में अर्जित किए गए प्लॉट संख्यांक :

1, 2 (भाग), 1018 (भाग), 1019 (भाग), 1020 (भाग), 1022.

सीमा वर्णन :

- रेखा क-ख : रेखा, मौजा बालीजुरि में प्लॉट सं. 1500, 1504, 1509, 1525 से होकर प्लॉट सं. 418, 417, 422, 427, 404, 2105 के उत्तर की ओर जाती है और बिन्दु “ख” पर मिलती है।
- रेखा ख-ग : रेखा, मौजा बालीजुरि के प्लॉट सं. 1551, 1552 से होकर प्लॉट सं. 1525, 1526, 1537, 1536, 1543, 1542 के पूर्व की ओर जाती है और मौजा बनेबंघी के प्लॉट सं. 180, 145, 183 से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु “ग” पर मिलती है।
- रेखा ग-घ : रेखा, मौजा बनेबंघी के प्लॉट सं. 183, 186 से होकर और मौजा मधईगंज के प्लॉट सं. 1019, 1018, 1020 से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु “घ” पर मिलती है।
- रेखा घ-ङ : रेखा, मौजा मधईगंज के प्लॉट सं. 1020, 1021 से होकर और मौजा बालीजुरि के प्लॉट सं. 2063 से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु “ङ” पर मिलती है।
- रेखा ङ-च : रेखा, मौजा बालीजुरि के प्लॉट सं. 1588, 1592, 1599, 1598, 1605, 1606, 1625, 1640, 1638, 1721 से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु “च” पर मिलती है।
- रेखा च-क : रेखा, मौजा बालीजुरि के प्लॉट सं. 353, 347, 343, 342, 415, 416, 418 से होकर प्लॉट सं. 1742, 1741 के पश्चिम की ओर जाती है और बिन्दु “क” पर मिलती है।

उपखंड-ख

सभी अधिकार

क्र. सं.	मौजा (ग्राम)	थाना सं. (अधिकारिता सूची संख्यांक)	पुलिस थाना	जिला	क्षेत्र एकड़ों में	टिप्पणिया
1.	मधईगंज	24	लौडोहा में फरीदपुर	बर्दमान	109.00	भाग
2.	जमगौरा	23	लौडोहा में फरीदपुर	बर्दमान	28.50	भाग

कुल :- 137.50 एकड़ (लगभग)

या

55.66 हेक्टर (लगभग)

मौजा मधईगंज में अर्जित किए गए प्लॉट संख्यांक :

24 (भाग), 31 (भाग), 32, 33 (भाग), 34 (भाग), 39 (भाग), 40 से 43, 44 (भाग), 45 (भाग), 46 से 73, 74 (भाग), 88 (भाग), 89 से 92, 93 (भाग), 97 (भाग), 98 (भाग), 99 (भाग), 153 (भाग), 154 (भाग), 158 (भाग), 159, 160 (भाग), 161 (भाग), 162 (भाग), 172 (भाग), 174 (भाग), 175 से 180, 182, 183 (भाग), 184 (भाग), 185, 977 (भाग), 967, 981, 982, 997 (भाग), 1013, 1066 (भाग), 1068 (भाग).

मौजा जमगौरा में अर्जित किए गए प्लॉट संख्यांक :

1 (भाग), 5 से 33, 3418, 35 (भाग), 36, 70, 71, 72, 73 (भाग), 1244, 1245 (भाग)।

सीमा वर्णन :

- रेखा छ-ज : रेखा, मौजा मधईगंज में प्लॉट सं. 88, 74, 24, 45, 44, 32, 33, 34 से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु “ज” पर मिलती है।
- रेखा ज-झ : रेखा, प्लॉट सं. 34, 39, 153, 154 से होकर, प्लॉट सं. 158, 1068, 1066 से होकर प्लॉट सं. 1013 के पूर्व की ओर जाती है और बिन्दु “झ” पर मिलती है।

रेखा स-अ: रेखा, मौजा मधर्गंज के प्लॉट सं. 1068, 162, 997, 183 से होकर प्लॉट सं. 185 के पूर्व की ओर जाती है और मौजा जमगीरा के प्लॉट सं. 73, 1245, 1 से होकर प्लॉट सं. 36, 35, 29, 33, 70 से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु "अ" पर मिलती है।

रेखा अ-आ/1 अ/2-अ/13 छ: रेखा, मौजा जमगीरा के प्लॉट सं. 1 से होकर, मौजा, मधर्गंज के प्लॉट सं. 977, 172, 174, 162, 1066 से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु अ-11 पर मिलती है, फिर 1066 के उत्तर की ओर जाती है और बिन्दु अ-12 पर मिलती है, फिर प्लॉट सं. 1068, 161, 160 से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु अ-13 पर मिलती है, फिर मौजा मधर्गंज के प्लॉट सं. 160, 154, 153, 93, 97, 98, 99 से होकर प्लॉट सं. 89 के पश्चिम की ओर जाती है और बिन्दु "छ" पर मिलती है।

उप-खण्ड ग

सभी अधिकार :

क्रम मौजा (ग्राम) सं.	थाना सं. (अधिकारिता सूची संख्यांक)	पूर्वित थाना	जिला	क्षेत्र एकड़ों में	टिप्पणियां
1. बालीजुरि	16	लौडोहा में फरीदपुर	बर्दमान	58.60	भाग
2. सिरशा	17	लौडोहा में फरीदपुर	बर्दमान	128.00	भाग

कुल : 186.60 एकड़ (लगभग) या
75.54 हेक्टर (लगभग)

मौजा बालीजुरि में अर्जित किए गए प्लॉट संख्यांक :

256, 257 से 260, 262 (भाग), 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 308 से 310, 311 (भाग), 312 (भाग), 325 (भाग), 326, 328 (भाग), 329, 330, 1757 (भाग), 1882 (भाग), 1883 से 1886, 1887 (भाग), 1888 से 1891, 1892 (भाग), 1893, 1896 (भाग), 1897 से 1904, 1905 (भाग), 1909 (भाग), 1908 (भाग), 1910 (भाग), 1911 से 1916, 1917 (भाग), 1918, 1919 (भाग), 1897/2127।

मौजा सिरशा में अर्जित किए गए प्लॉट संख्यांक :

721, 722 (भाग), 723 (भाग), 724 (भाग), 725, 726 (भाग), 727, 728 (भाग), 729 से 731, 736 (भाग), 2344, 1968 (भाग), 2044 से 2057, 2058 (भाग), 2345, 2379.

सीमा वर्णन :

रेखा ट-ठ: रेखा, मौजा सिरशा के प्लॉट सं. 736 के उत्तर-पश्चिम की ओर प्लॉट सं. 736, 731, 729 के उत्तर की ओर प्लॉट सं. 723, 2058 से होकर प्लॉट सं. 1944, 1945, 1946, 1968, 2040 के दक्षिण की ओर जाती है, प्लॉट सं. 254, 255 के दक्षिण की ओर प्लॉट सं. 256, 330, 326, के उत्तर की ओर जाती है और मौजा बालीजुरि में बिन्दु "ठ" पर मिलती है।

रेखा ठ-ड-ड: रेखा, मौजा बालीजुरि के प्लॉट सं. 325, 312 से होकर प्लॉट सं. 326 के उत्तर की ओर जाती है और बिन्दु "ड" पर मिलती है, फिर प्लॉट सं. 308, 2069, 256 के दक्षिण की ओर प्लॉट सं. 311 से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु "ड" पर मिलती है।

रेखा ड-ड-त: रेखा, मौजा बालीजुरि के प्लॉट सं. 256, 260 के पूर्व की ओर प्लॉट सं. 262, 263 से होकर, प्लॉट सं. 263, 267, 1897, 1896 के उत्तर की ओर जाती है और बिन्दु "ण" पर मिलती है फिर प्लॉट सं. 1897, 1896 से होकर प्लॉट सं. 1893 के उत्तर की ओर जाती है, प्लॉट सं. 1892, 1890, 1757 से होकर प्लॉट सं. 1883 के उत्तर और पूर्व की ओर जाती है और बिन्दु "त" पर मिलती है।

रेखा त-थ-ट: रेखा, मौजा, बालीजुरि के प्लॉट सं. 1882, 1887, 1905, 1908, 1929, 1910, 1929, 1937 से होकर जाती है, फिर प्लॉट सं. 1917 के दक्षिण की ओर जाती है, फिर मौजा सिरशा के प्लॉट सं. 2058, 728, 726, 723, 724, 722, 736, 795 से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु "ट" पर मिलती है।

उप-खण्ड -"घ"

सभी अधिकार

क्र. मौजा (ग्राम) सं.	थाना सं. (अधिकारिता सूची सं.)	पूर्वित थाना	जिला	क्षेत्र एकड़ों में	टिप्पणियां
1. नवधनपुर	19	लौडोहा में फरीदपुर	बर्दमान	67.00	भाग

कुल 67.00 एकड़ (लगभग) या
27.12 हेक्टर (लगभग)

मौजा नवधनपुर में अर्जित किए गए प्लॉट संख्यांक :

44 से 76, 77 (भाग), 78 (भाग), 80 (भाग), 90 से 92, 93 (भाग), 94, 95, 96 (भाग), 196 (भाग), 189 (भाग), 222 से 224, 225, 226 (भाग), 227 (भाग), 228 (भाग), 231 (भाग), 214, से 216 218, 231, 241 (भाग), 245, 246 (भाग), 247 (भाग), 248, 249 (भाग), 250 (भाग), 251 (भाग), 252 से 267, 268 (भाग), 269 (भाग), 270, 271 (भाग), 272 (भाग), 273 (भाग), 274, 275 (भाग), 276, 277, 278 (भाग), 279 से 282, 285, 286, 291, 299 (भाग), 300 (भाग), 301 से 303, 304 (भाग), 314 (भाग), 315 (भाग), 316 (भाग), 318 (भाग), 1046 (भाग), 319 (भाग), 1047 (भाग), 1052 (भाग), 216/1533, 1621 (भाग), 1629 (भाग), 1630 से 1638, 1639 (भाग), 1655, 1658 (भाग), 278/1495 (भाग), 252/1496, 258/1535, 76/1538, 1049/1606 (भाग), 1616 (भाग), 1617 (भाग), 282/1494.

सीमा वर्णन :

रेखा द/1-द/2 : रेखा प्लॉट सं. 244, 225, 226, 227, 228 से होकर जाती है और बिंदु "द/2" पर मिलती है।

रेखा द/2-घ/1 : रेखा, प्लॉट सं. 228 के दक्षिण की ओर प्लॉट सं. 214, 215, 216 के पश्चिम की ओर, प्लॉट सं. 225 के दक्षिण की ओर, प्लॉट सं. 225 के पश्चिम की ओर, प्लॉट सं. 189 के दक्षिण के ओर जाती है और बिंदु "घ/1" मिलती है।

रेखा घ/1-घ/2 : रेखा प्लॉट सं. 189, 196 से होकर प्लॉट सं. 252, 253, 254 के पश्चिम की ओर जाती है। प्लॉट सं. 96, 93, 88, 80, 77, 1495 से होकर प्लॉट सं. 44, 46, 47 के उत्तर की ओर जाती है। प्लॉट सं. 1639, 299, 1046, 1653, 1660, 1657 से होकर जाती है और बिंदु "घ/2" पर मिलती है।

रेखा घ/2-न/1-न/2 : रेखा प्लॉट सं. 1657 के पूर्व की ओर जाती है और बिंदु न/1 पर मिलती है, प्लॉट सं. 1658 से होकर बिंदु न/2" पर मिलती है, प्लॉट सं. 1616, 1647 से होकर प्लॉट सं. 1621, 1617, 1606 के पश्चिम की ओर प्लॉट सं. 1052 के पूर्व की ओर जाती है और बिंदु "न" पर मिलती है।

रेखा न-द/1 : रेखा प्लॉट सं. 1052, 1046, 300, 304 से होकर प्लॉट सं. 314, 315, 317 के पूर्व, दक्षिण और पश्चिम की ओर प्लॉट सं. 278 से होकर प्लॉट सं. 318 के पूर्व और दक्षिण की ओर, प्लॉट सं. 319, 275, 273, 271, 269, 268, 250/251, 249, 246 से होकर जाती है और मौजा नवधनपुर में जिसके अन्तर्गत वह क्षेत्र नहीं है जा सीमा 1-2-3-4-द्वारा चिह्नित रेखांक में पीत अन्तर्गत क्षेत्र है, बिंदु "द/1" पर मिलती है।

उप-खंड

सभी अधिकार :

क्र.सं.	मौजा (ग्राम)	थाना सं०	पुलिस थाना	जिला	क्षेत्र एकड़ों में	टिप्पणियां
		(अधिकारिता सूची संख्यांक)				
1.	सिरशा	17	लौडौहा में फरीदपुर	वर्दमान	29.00	भाग
कुल : 29.00 एकड़ (लगभग) या 11.74 हेक्टर (लगभग)						

मौजा सिरशा में अर्जित किए गए प्लॉट संख्यांक :

418, 419, 455 (भाग), 499, 501 से 505 (भाग), 506 (भाग), 507 (भाग), 509 (भाग), 574 (भाग), 575 (भाग), 576 (भाग), 577 से 591, 592 (भाग), 593 से 596, 597, 598 (भाग), 603 से 605, 606 (भाग), 607 (भाग), 610 (भाग), 611 (भाग), 619 (भाग), 681 (भाग), 2123 (भाग), 2124 से 2133, 2134 (भाग), 2141 (भाग), 2142 (भाग), 2148 (भाग), 2172 (भाग), 2189 (भाग), 2190.

सीमा वर्णन :

रेखा फ/1-ब/1 : रेखा प्लॉट सं. 510 के दक्षिण की ओर प्लॉट सं. 509, 506, 507, 575, 576, 681, 592, 597, 598, 611, 619 से होकर जाती है और बिंदु "ब/1" पर मिलती है।

रेखा ब/1-भ/1 : रेखा प्लॉट सं. 610, 607, 606, 2123, 2148, 2142, 2141, 2134, 2172, 2189 से होकर जाती है और बिंदु "भ/1" पर मिलती है।

रेखा भ/1-फ/1 : रेखा मौजा सिरशा में प्लॉट सं. 2172, 581, 2189, 2190, 498, 499, 501, 419, 418 के पश्चिम की ओर प्लॉट सं. 418 के उत्तर की ओर जाती है और बिंदु "फ/1" पर मिलती है।

[फा. सं. 43015/2/90-एल.एस.डब्ल्यू.]

एन. भगत, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF COAL

New Delhi, the 24th November, 1994

S.O. 3498 :—Whereas by the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Coal No. S.O. 371, dated the 8th January, 1992 issued under Sub-Section (1) of Section 7 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) and published in the Gazette of India, Part-II, Section-3, Sub-section (ii), dated the 1st January, 1992, the Central Government gave notice of its intention to acquire the lands in the locality specified in the Schedule appended to that notification;

And whereas the competent authority in pursuance of section 8 of the said Act has made his report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government after considering the report aforesaid and after consulting the Government of West Bengal, is satisfied that the lands measuring 540.00 acres (approximately) or 218.60 hectares (approximately) described in the Schedule (sub-blocks 'A', 'B', 'C', 'D' and 'E') appended hereto should be acquired.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 9 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the lands measuring 540.00 acres (approximately) or 218.60 hectares (approximately) described in the said Schedule are hereby acquired.

The plan No. ECL/JNR/LA/89/18, dated the 25th October, 1989 of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the office of the Collector, Burdwan (West Bengal) or in the office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta or in the office of the Director (Technical), Eastern Coalfields Limited, Sanctoria, Post Office Dishergarh, District Burdwan (West Bengal).

SCHEDULE

RANIGANJ BLOCK-XI EXTENSION

RANIGANJ COALFIELDS

(Drawing No. ECL/JNR/LA/89/18, dated the 25th October, 1989, showing the lands acquired).

SUB-BLOCK—A

ALL RIGHTS

Sl. No.	Mouza (Village)	Thana number (Jurisdiction List) number)	Police Station	District	Area in Acres	Remarks
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1.	Benebandhi	11	Faridpur at Laudoha	Burdwan	9.00	Part
2.	Balijuri	16	Faridpur at Laudoha	Burdwan	110.00	Part
3.	Madhaiganj	24	Faridpur at Laudoha	Burdwan	0.09	Part

Total : —119.90 acres
(approximately) or
48.54 hectares
(approximately).

Plot numbers acquired in mouza Benebandhi:

145(P), 180(P), 183(P), 184, 185, 186(P).

Plot numbers acquired in mouza Balijuri :

342(P), 343, 347, 352(P), 353(P) 354 to 414, 354/2086, 377/2071, 415(P), 416(P), 417, 418(P) 422., 427, 1501 to 1053, 1504(P), 1505 to 1508, 1509(P), 1525(P) 1526, 1536 to 1543, 1549(P) 1551(P), 1552(P), 1553 to 1587, 1588(P), 1590, 1592(P), 1598(P), 1600 to 1604, 1605(P), 1606(P) 1625(P), 1628 to 1637, 1638(P), 1639, 1640(P), 1721(P), 1724 to 1741 1742(P), 1599(P), 404/2117, 1501/2105, 1574/2137.

Plot numbers acquired in mouza Madhaiganj:

2(P), 1018(P), 1019(P), 1020(P), 1022.

Boundary description :

Line A—B : Line passes to the north of plot numbers 418, 417, 422, 427, 404, 2105 and through plot numbers 1500, 1504, 1509, 1525 and meets at point 'B' in mouza Balijuri.

Line B—C : Line passes to the east of plot numbers 1525, 1526, 1537, 1536, 1543, 1542 and through plot numbers 1551, 1552 of mouza Balijuri and through plot numbers 180, 145, 183 of mouza Benibandhi and meets at point 'C'.

Line C—D : Line passes through plot numbers 1823, 186 of mouza Benibandhi and through plot numbers 1019, 1018, 1020 of mouza Madhaiganj and meets with point 'D'.

Line D—E : Line passes through plot numbers 1020, 1021 of mouza Madhaiganj and through plot numbers 2063 of mouza Balijuri and meets at point 'E'.

Line E—F : Line passes through plot numbers 1588, 1592, 1599, 1598, 1605, 1606, 1625, 1640, 1638, 1721 of mouza Balijuri and meets at point 'F'.

Line F—A : Line passes to the West of plot numbers 1742, 1741, through plot numbers 353, 347, 343 through plot numbers 342, 415, 416, 418 of mouza Balijuri and meets at point 'A'.

SUB BLOCK—B

ALL RIGHTS

Serial No.	Mouza (Village)	Thana number (Jurisdiction List number)	Police Station	District	Area in acres	Remarks
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(8)
1	Madhaiganj	24	Faridpur at Landoba	Burdwan	109.00	Part
2	Jamgora	23	Faridpur at Landoba	Burdwan	28.50	Part

Total : 137.50 acres
(approximately) or
55.66 hectares
(approximately)

Plot numbers acquired in mouza Madhaiganj :

24(P), 31(P), 32, 33(P), 34(P), 39(P), 40 to 43, 44(P), 45(P), 46 to 73, 74(P), 88(P), 89 to 92, 93(P), 97(P), 98(P), 99(P), 153(P), 154(P), 158(P), 159, 160(P), 161(P), 162(P), 172(P), 174(P), 175, to 180, 182, 183(P), 184(P), 185, 977(P), 967, 981, 982, 997(P), 1013, 1066(P), 1068(P).

Plot numbers acquired in mouza Jamgora :

1(P), 5 to 33, 3418, 35(P), 36, 70, 71, 72, 73(P), 1244, 1245(P).

Boundary description :

Line G—H : Line passes through plot numbers 88, 74, 24, 45, 44, 32, 33, 34 and meets at point 'H' in mouza Madhaiganj.

Line H—I : Line passes through plot numbers 34, 39, 153, 154 to the east of plot numbers 1013 through plot numbers 153, 1068, 1066 and meets at point 'I'.

Line I—J : Line passes through plot numbers 1068, 162, 997, 183, to the east of plot number 185 of mouza Madhaiganj and plot numbers 36, 35, 29, 33, 70 through plot numbers 73, 1245, 1 of mouza Jamgora and meets at point 'J'.

Line J—J/I—J/2—J/3—G : Line passes through plot number 1 of mouza Jamgora through plot numbers 977, 172, 174, 162, 1066 of mouza Madhaiganj and meets at point 'J/1', then to the north of plot number 1066 and meets at point 'J/2', then through plot numbers 1068, 161, 160 and meets at point 'J/3', then through plot numbers 160, 154, 153, 93, 97, 98, 99, to the West of plot number 89 of mouza Madhaiganj and meets at point 'G'.

SUB-BLOCK—C

ALL RIGHTS

Sl. No.	Mouza (Village)	Thana number (Jurisdiction List number)	Police Station	District	Area in acres	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Balijuri	16	Faridpur at Laudoha	Burdwan	58.60	Part
2.	Sirsha	17	Faridpur at Laudoha	Burdwan	128.00	Part

Total : 186.60 acres
(approximately) or
75.54 hectares
(approximately)

Plot numbers acquired in mouza Balijuri :

256, 257 to 260, 262(P), 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 308 to 310, 311(P), 312(P), 325(P), 326, 328(P), 329, 330, 1757(P), 1882(P), 1883 to 1886, 1887(P), 1888 to 1891, 1892(P), 1893, 1896 (P), 1897 to 1904, 1905(P), 1909(P), 1908(P), 1910(P), 1911 to 1916, 1917(P), 1918, 1919(P), 1897/2127.

Plot numbers acquired in mouza Sirsha :

721, 722(P), 723(P), 724(P), 725, 726(P), 727, 728(P), 729 to 731, 736(P), 2344, 1968(P), 2044 to 2057, 2058(P), 2345, 2379.

Boundary description :

- Line K-L : Line passes to the north west of plot number, 736, to the north of plot numbers, 736, 731, 729 and through plot numbers 728, 2058 to the south of plot numbers 1944, 1945, 1946, 1968, 2040 of mouza Sirsha, to the south of plot numbers 254, 255, to the north of plot numbers 256, 330, 326 and meets at point 'L' at mouza Balijuri.
- Line L-M-N : Lines passes to the north of plot number 326, through plot numbers 325, 312, and meets at point 'M', then passes through plot number 311 to the south of plot numbers 308, 2069, 256 and meets at point 'N' of mouza Balijuri.
- Line N-O-P : Lines passes to the east of plot numbers 256, 260, through plot numbers 262, 263, to the east of plot numbers 263, 267, 1897 and meets at point 'O' then passes through plot numbers 1897, 1896 to the north of plot number 1893, through plot numbers 1892, 1880, 1757, to the north and east of plot number 1883 and meets at point 'P' of mouza Balijuri.
- Line P-Q-K : Line passes through plot numbers 1882, 1887, 1905, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1919, 1917, then to the south of plot number 1917 of mouza Balijuri then through plot numbers 2058, 728, 726, 723, 724, 722, 736, 795 and meets at point 'K' of mouza Sirsha.

SUB BLOCK—D

ALL RIGHTS

Serial number	Mouza (Village)	Thana number (Jurisdiction List number)	Police Station	District	Area in acres	Remarks
1.	Nabaghanapur	19	Faridpur at Laudoha	Burdwan	67.00	Part

Total :— 67.00 acres
(approximately) or 27.12
hectares (approximately)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(Directorate of Marketing and Inspection)

Faridabad, the 16th November, 1994

S.O. 3500.—I, R. N. Bansal, Agricultural Marketing Adviser to the Government of India, in exercise of the powers conferred on me under the General Grading and Marking Rules, 1988, hereby authorise Deputy Agricultural Marketing Advisers, Incharge of Directorate of Marketing and Inspection's Offices at Chandigarh, Cochin, Guwahati and Kanpur to exercise the following powers in regard to grading and marking of agricultural and allied products in accordance with the Rules made under the provisions of the Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking) Act, 1937 (1 of 1937).—

- (i) Rule 3—To grant the Certificate of Authorisation for grading and marking of an article in accordance with the provisions of the Rules made under the Act;
- (ii) Rule 4—To renew the Certificate of Authorisation in respect of export grading and centralised grading;
- (iii) Rule 5—To record changes in the name, style or address of the authorised packer and change of authorised premises in the Certificate of Authorisation;
- (iv) Rule 7—To suspend or cancel any Certificate of Authorisation, if he is satisfied :—
 - (a) that the authorised packer has not applied the grade designation marks correctly; or
 - (b) that the authorised packer has contravened any of the provisions of the Act; or
 - (c) that the authorised packer has violated any Rule or has failed to comply with any of the instructions issued under the provisions of the Act, subject to the conditions as stipulated under Sub-rules (2) and (3) of Rule-7.
- (v) Rule 8—To approve the laboratory set up by the packer for grading and marking of an article under provisions of the Act;
- (vi) Rule 9—To approve the Chemist appointed by the packer for manning the grading laboratory;
- (vii) Rule 9(5)—To withdraw the approval accorded to the Chemist for grading and marking of an article under provisions of the Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking) Act, 1937, if the Chemist has failed to comply with the instructions or violated any Rule; provided that an opportunity shall be given to the approved Chemist for showing cause as to why the approval should not be withdrawn.
- (viii) Rule 10(3)—To grant permission for use of 'Agmark replica' in lieu of Agmark labels to the authorised packers;
- (ix) Rule 10(5)—To grant permission to the printing press or manufacturing units for printing and/or manufacturing of the containers bearing the "Agmark replica";

(x) Rule 11—To allow relaxation/modification in the mode of packing of graded article and to approve the private marks, trade brand label to be affixed on the graded article;

(xi) Rule 15—To call for information, reports or returns in respect of any of the scheduled articles from the authorised packers.

[No. Q-11011/1/94-QC.II]

R. N. BANSAL, Agricultural Marketing Adviser

इस्पात मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 7 नवम्बर, 1994

का.आ. 3501 —केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 2 के खंड (क) के अनुसरण में, नीचे दी गई अनुसूची के स्तंभ (1) में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों की उक्त अनुसूची के स्तंभ (2) में तत्संबंधी प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट क्षेत्र में उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी का कार्य करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है :

अनुसूची

प्राधिकारी	क्षेत्रीय अधिकारिता
श्री एन.एस. मंडावी, संयुक्त कलकट्टर और एस.डी.एम. (राजस्व), जगदलपुर, मध्य प्रदेश।	मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में दन्तेवाड़ा और बस्तर जिले के दन्तेवाड़ा, सुकमा और कोन्टा तालुक
राजस्व अधिकारी, प्रभाशी अधिकारी, कलकट्टरी राजस्व अनुभाग, मलकानगिरि कलकट्टरी, मलकानगिरि, उड़ीसा।	उड़ीसा राज्य में मलकानगिरि जिले के मलकानगिरि और चिरकोण्डा तालुक
उप कलकट्टर, पांडेरू, पांडेरू राजस्व डिबिजन, विशाखापटनम, आन्ध्र प्रदेश	पांडेरू डिबिजन, विशाखापटनम जिला, आन्ध्र प्रदेश
राजस्व प्रभागीय अधिकारी, सरसीपटनम, विशाखापटनम, आन्ध्र प्रदेश	आन्ध्र प्रदेश में विशाखापटनम जिले के सरसीपटनम और विशाखापटनम तालुक

[सं. बी.एन.एस.-12/3/91-आई.डी.एस.]

के. किपगेन, संयुक्त सचिव

MINISTRY OF STEEL

New Delhi, the 7th November, 1994

S.O. 3501.—In pursuance of clause (a) of Section 2 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby authorises the persons mentioned in column (1) of the Schedule below to perform the functions of the competent authority under the said Act in the area specified in the corresponding entry in column (2) of the said Schedule.

SCHEDULE

Authority	Territorial Jurisdiction
1	2
Mr N S Mandavi Joint Collector and SDM (Revenue) Jagdalpur Madhya Pradesh. Revenue Officer Officer Incharge Revenue Section of Collectorate Malkangiri Collectorate Malkangiri, Orissa. Sug Collector Paderu, Paderu Revenue Division Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh. Revenue Divisional Officer, Narsipatnam Visakhapatnam Andhra Pradesh	Doantewada, Sukma and Kanta Taluks of Doantawada and Bastar Districts in the State of Madhya Pradesh. Malkangiri and Chitrukonda Taluks of Malkangiri District in the State of Orissa. Paderu Division Visakhapatnam District, Andhra Pradesh. Narsipatnam and Visakhapatnam Taluk of Visakhapatnam District, Andhra Pradesh.

[No. VNS-12/3/91-IDS]

K. KIPGEN, Jt. Secy.

धर्म मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 20 नवम्बर, 1994

क्र.आ. 3502 — औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, एस ई सी एल के प्रबन्धन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, भुवनेश्वर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 15-11-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/208/88-आई आर(सी-II)]

राजा लाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 20th November, 1994

S.O. 3502.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal Bhubaneswar as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of S.E.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 15-11-1994.

[No. L-22012/208/88-IR (C-II)]

RAJA LAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, ORISSA, BHUBANESWAR
PRESENT :

Sri P. K. Tripathy, M.A. LL.B.,
Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal,
Orissa, Bhubaneswar.

Industrial Dispute Case No. 14 of 1989 (Central)
Bhubaneswar, the 7th November, 1994

BETWEEN

The management of M/s. Deulbera Colliery of S.E.C. Ltd., At/P.O. Deulbera, Dist. Dhenkanal—First party-management.

AND

Their workman Sri Kuber Naik represented through Orissa Coalfields Labour Union, At/P.O. Deulbera, Dist. Dhenkanal —Second party-workman.

APPEARANCES :

Sri R. S. Sharma, Dy. Personnel Manager—For the first party-management.

Sri T. Tigga, Vice-President of the Union—For the second party-workman.

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of powers conferred upon it by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2-A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) have referred the

following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal vide their Order No. L-22012/208/88-IR (C-II) dated 20-6-89 :—

"Whether the action of the Management of Deulbera Colliery of M/s. South Eastern Coalfields Ltd., in terminating services of Sri Kubera Naik, Loader with effect from 9-7-88 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled?"

2. On 22-10-94, to which date the case was posted for hearing argument, both the parties by filing a joint petition alongwith a memorandum of settlement prayed to dispose of the case in terms of the settlement arrived at between them. The terms of settlement were readover and explained to the parties to which they admitted to be true and correct. The terms of the settlement are mentioned below :—

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

- (1) Shri Kubera Naik, Ex-Loader of Deulbera Colliery will be reinstated as Loader within 15 days of submission of compromise ;
- (2) Shri Kubera Naik shall not be entitled to any back wages and other benefits whatsoever for the period of absence i.e. 9-7-88 till date of joining. However, the period for 9-7-88 till date of joining will be created "Dies noth".
- (3) The Industrial Dispute case pending before the Hon'ble Industrial Tribunal as I. D. Case No. 14/89 (C) shall stand withdrawn in view of the settlement and a copy of the settlement shall be filed before the Hon'ble Tribunal, Bhubaneswar in this regard to this dispute.
- (4) This is full and final settlement in regard to this dispute. No parties including the workman and any other Union will raise any dispute in this regard.

3. While explaining the terms of the settlement as aforesaid, both the parties stated that as per Sl. No. 1 of the terms of settlement the workman will be reinstated in service by 23-10-94. The terms of the settlement being fair are recorded. An award is passed in terms of the settlement which do form part of the Award.

Dictated and corrected by me.

Dated : 7-11-1994

P. K. TRIPATHY, Presiding Officer

FORM 'H'

(See Rule 58)

Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules, 1957

(Memorandum of Settlement)

Dated _____

Place : Deulbera Colliery.

Representing the employer—(Shri M. V. K. Naidu)
Project Officer, Deulbera Colliery.

Representing Workman—(Kubera Naik) Terminated
Loader, Deulbera Colliery.

SHORT RECITAL OF THE CASE

Shri Kubera Naik, Son of Benudhar Naik was working as Loader of Deulbera Colliery of Talcher Area. Shri Kubera Naik was chargesheeted vide letter No. P.O. (D&H)/Cond. Disp./88/1874 dated 22-4-88 for misconduct under Clause 17(i)(n) of the Certified Standing Orders (Coal Mines) by which his services was covered. After submission of the reply to the chargesheet an enquiry was conducted and his services were terminated vide termination Order No. PO (D&H)/Cond. Disp./88/3145 dated 8-7-1988.

Shri Naik raised Industrial Dispute before the Asst. Labour Commissioner (Central), Bhubaneswar/Conciliation Officer. The proceeding of the Conciliation ended in to failure. Subsequently, the Desk Officer referred the dispute to the Industrial Tribunal, Bhubaneswar for adjudication.

The reference was numbered as I.D. Case No. 14/89 (C) by the Industrial Tribunal, Bhubaneswar. While the hearing of the case is pending before the Hon'ble Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bhubaneswar, the parties agreed to settle the dispute mutually out of the Court. After discussion between the parties i.e. the workman concerned Shri Kubera Naik (Ex-Employee of Deulbera Colliery), the following settlement has been arrived at :—

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

1. Shri Kubera Naik, Ex-Loader of Deulbera Colliery will be re-instated as Loader within 15 days of submission of compromise.
2. Shri Kubera Naik shall not be entitled to any back wages and other benefits whatsoever for the period of absence i.e. 9-7-88 till date of joining. However the period for 9-7-88 till date of joining will be created "Dies noth".
3. The Industrial Dispute case pending before the Hon'ble Industrial Tribunal as I. D. case No. 14/89 (C) shall stand withdrawn in view of the settlement and a copy of the settlement shall be filed before the Hon'ble Tribunal, Bhubaneswar in this regard to this dispute.
4. This is full and final settlement in regard to this dispute. No parties including the workman and any other Union will raise any dispute in this regard.

Sd/-

(Kubera Naik)
Ex-Workman, Deulbera
Colliery.

Sd/-

(M. V. K. Naidu)

Project Officer, Deulbera
Colliery/Management Representative.

Signature of the Witnesses

Sd/-

1. (T. Tgiga)
Vice-President,
Orissa Coalfields
Labour Union.

Sd/-

1. (R. S. Sharma)
Dy. Personnel Manager,
M.C. Ltd. Talcher Area.

नई दिल्ली, 20 नवम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3503.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डब्ल्यू.सी. एल. के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निश्चित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण जबलपुर, के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-11-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल - 22012/123/92-आईआर (सी-II)]

राजा लाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th November, 1994

S.O. 3503.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of W.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which received by the Central Government on 16-11-1994.

[No. L-22012/123/92-IR (C-II)]

RAJA LAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR(MP)

Case Ref. No. CGIT/LC(R)(211)/1992

BETWEEN

S/Shri Ganesh and 613 others (list not attached with the reference order) represented through the Secretary, Rashtriya Koyla Khadan Mazdoor Sangh (INTUC) P.O. Chandametta, District Chhindwara (MP).

AND

The General Manager, W.C.L. Kanhan Area, P.O. Dungaria, District Chhindwara (MP).

PRESENT :

Shri Arvind Kumar Awasthy, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For Workmen—Shri P. Modi.

For Management—Shri B. B. Mishra.

INDUSTRY : Coal Mine DISTRICT : Chhindwara (MP)

AWARD

Dated, October 20, 1994

This is a reference made by the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-22012/123/92-IR (C-II) dated 1-10-1992 for adjudication of the following dispute :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the Rashtriya Koyla Khadan Mazdoor Sangh (INTUC), Chandametta that the basic wages of S/Shri Ganesh and 613 others (as per list attached) in Category I of General Mazdoor be fixed at 44.47 paise per day as on 1-1-1991 by the management of Kanhan Area of W.C. Ltd. in relation to their Nandan Colliery is lawful and justified. If so, to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to ?"

2. The Parties have not filed the statement of claim. Parties have prayed for consent award in terms of the settlement. Settlement was verified by the parties, settlement is just and proper and it is accepted. Following are the terms of settlement :—

TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENT

1. In view of the settlement dated 2-11-1992 arrived between RKKMS (INTUC) and WCL before RJC (C), Nagpur, it is agreed that the cases of existing DPRS of Nandan Group whose dispute is pending before the CGIT Jabalpur, for adjudication regarding their pay protection, out of such DPRS whose conversion has been done in TR categories shall be given notional (fixation keeping giving the wage protection from the date of their conversion in TR categories. In case while fixation their basic pay so fixed in TR categories, exceeds the maximum to the category in which they are placed, balance will be treated as personal pay which shall be adjusted in the subsequent revision of pay/promotion.
2. As regards the payment of arrears to such DPRS, it is agreed that arrears payment arising out of fitment benefit will be effective from 1-1-1992 onwards only and the payment will be done to such DPRs by the end of March, 1994.
3. It is further agreed that in case any one out of such DPRs had given their option (Self written) for TR jobs, such cases shall not be considered for wage protection and fixation benefit.
4. This is full and final settlement of the case and will not be sighted as an example in other case.

5 The union agreed to file the settlement before the Jabalpur for consent award.

3. In view of the terms of settlement no dispute award is passed. Parties to bear their own costs

ARVIND KUMAR AWASTHY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 नवम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3504.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डब्ल्यू सी एल. के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-11-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल - 22012/206/91 - आई आर (सी - II)]

राजा लाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th November, 1994

S.O. 3504.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of W.C. Ltd. and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on 16-11-1994.

[No. L-22012/206/91-IR (C-II)]

RAJA LAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(179)/1991

BETWEEN

Shri Sakaru S/o Kunji represented through the Samyukta Koyla Mazdoor Sangh (AITUC), Post Chandametta, District Chhindwara (MP)-480001.

AND

The General Manager, Kanhan Area of W.C.L., Post Dungaria, District Chhindwara (MP)-480001

PRESENT :

Shri Arvind Kumar Awasthy, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For Workman—Shri P. K. Banerjee.

For Management—Shri A. K. Shasi, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal Mine DISTRICT : Chhindwara (M.P.)

AWARD

Dated, October 20, 1994

This is a reference made by the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-22012/206/91-IR (Coal-II) dated 7-10-1991, for adjudication of the following dispute :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of WCL Kanhan Area in relation to their Rakhikol Colliery in terminating/dismissing the services of Shri Sakaru S/o Kunji Trammer w.e.f. 3-10-1989 is justified and proportionate to the gravity of offence. If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to ?"

2. The workman and the management have not filed the statement of claim. Both the parties after the mutual discussions have agreed to withdraw the cases from the Tribunal, they have filed the terms and conditions of the settlement and they have prayed for passing no dispute award in terms of the settlement.

3. After the perusal of the terms and conditions of the settlement, no dispute award cannot be passed. However, the terms of the settlement are just and proper. They are accepted. Following are the terms and conditions of the settlement :—

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1. It is agreed by both the parties that the above six cases will be given for arbitration to Hon'ble Arbitrator, Shri S. S. Mishra, Ex. Dy. CPM, WCL, Hqrs. and his decision will be final and binding on both the parties.
2. It is agreed by both the parties that this settlement will be requested to give the Award within 3 months and if necessary, will extend the time limit in consultation with both the parties.
3. It is agreed by both the parties that this settlement will be filed before the CGIT, Jabalpur in above referred six cases, with a request to give No Dispute Award.
4. This is full and final settlement in the said referred six cases and union and management will finalise the reference within a week time and submit the various authorities as per law.
4. Consequently, the reference is answered as per aforesaid terms of the settlement. Parties have agreed to enter into settlement as per decision of the Arbitrator, Shri S. S. Mishra, Ex. Dy. Chief Personnel Manager. Parties to bear their own costs.

ARVIND KUMAR AWASTHY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 नवम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3505.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उल्फू सी एल. के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-11-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/207/91-आईआर (सी-II)]

राजा लाल, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th November, 1994

S.O. 3505.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of W.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 16-11-1994.

[No. L-22012/207/91-IR (C-II)]

RAJA LAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (MP)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(139)/1991

BETWEEN

Shri Shankar Lal S/o Sukhlal, represented through the Secretary, Samyukta Koyla Mazdoor Sangh (AITUC) Post Chandametta, District Chhindwara (MP)-480447,

AND

The General Manager, Kanhan Area of W.C.L., Post Dungaria, District Chhindwara-480553.

PRESENT :

Shri Arvind Kumar Awasthy, Presiding Officer.

For workman—Shri P. K. Banerjee.

For Management—Shri G. S. Kapoor, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal Mine DISTRICT : Chhindwara (M.P.)

AWARD

Dated, October 20, 1994

This is a reference made by the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-22012/207/91-IR (Coal-II) dated 29-7-1991 for adjudication of the following dispute :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of W.C.L. Kanhan area in relation to their Rakhkol Colliery in dismissing/terminating the services of Shri Shankarlal S/o Sukhlal, DPR w.e.f. 23-6-1989 is legal and justified and whether it is proportionate to the gravity of offence committed by the workman? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. The workman and the management have not filed the statement of claim. Both the parties after the mutual discussion have agreed to withdraw the cases from the Tribunal. They have filed the terms and conditions of the settlement and they have prayed for passing no dispute award in terms of the settlement.

3. After the perusal of the terms and conditions of the settlement, no dispute award cannot be passed. However, the terms of the settlement are just and proper. They are accepted. Following are the terms and conditions of the settlement :—

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1. It is agreed by both the parties that the above six cases will be given for arbitration to Hon'ble Arbitrator, Shri S. S. Mishra, Ex. Dy. CPM, WCL, Hqrs. and his decision will be final and binding on both the parties.
2. It is agreed by both the parties that the Arbitrator will be requested to give the Award within 3 months and if necessary will extend the time limit in consultation with both the parties.
3. It is agreed by both the parties that this settlement will be filed before the CGIT, Jabalpur in above referred six cases, with a request to give No Dispute Award.
4. This is full and final settlement in the said referred six cases and union and management will finalise the reference within a week time and submit the various authorities as per law.

4. Consequently, the reference is answered as per aforesaid terms of the settlement. Parties have agreed to enter into settlement as per decision of the Arbitrator, Shri S. S. Mishra, Ex. Dy. Chief Personnel Manager. Parties to bear their own costs.

ARVIND KUMAR AWASTHY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 नवम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3506.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डब्ल्यू सी एल के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-11-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल - 22011/56/83 - डी III (बी)]
राजा लाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th November, 1994

S.O. 3506.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of W.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16-11-94.

[No. L-22011/56/83-DIII(B)]
RAJA LAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(96)/1986

BETWEEN

The President, Staff Association, Johilla Sub-area of W.C. Ltd., P.O. Nowrozabad Colliery, district Shahdol (M.P.).

AND

The Sub-Area Manager, Johilla Sub-Area of W.C. Ltd., P.O. Nowrozabad colliery, district Shahdol (M.P.).

PRESENT :

Shri Arvind Kumar Awasthy, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For Union : Shri R. K. Gupta, Advocate.

For Management : Shri A.K. Shasi, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal Mine DISTRICT : Shahdol (M.P.)

AWARD

Dated : November 8, 1994

This is a reference made by the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-22011/56/83-D.III(B) dated 24th November, 1986, for adjudication of the following dispute :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Sub-Area Manager, Johilla Sub-Area of W.C. Ltd., are justified in not conceding the 7 demands of the Staff Association, Johilla sub-area, W.C. Ltd., as contained in the Appendix ? If not, to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled ?"

2. The Appendix of Demand of the Staff Associations, Johilla Sub-area, W.C. Ltd. are as under :—

APPENDIX

1. Promotion of Shri Mohan Lal Khare, Clerk Gr. I to Clerical special grade.
2. Regularisation of Shri Bhaiyalal Yadav, Cashier/Clerk of Johilla Sub-Area.
3. Promotion/Regularisation of Clerks Gr. II to I.

2134 GI/94—4

4. Promotion/Regularisation of Clerks Gr. III to Gr. II.
5. Regularisation as tub writers.
6. Sick leave payment of Shri G. S. Mehta, Store Clerk.
7. Non standard house rent allowance to Shri D. P. Shrivastava, Clerk Gr. II.

3. The statement of claim was filed by the Union and after filing the written statement and the documents the case was posted for evidence. Parties pray to pass a consent award in terms of settlement as under :—

1. That the grievances from 1 to 7 which are appendix to the terms of reference have been redressed by the management individually and collectively.
2. That after the redressal of the grievances the association as well as individuals are fully satisfied with the action taken by the management.
3. That since Shri Mohanlal Khare is non-matric his case is not covered by the Cadre Scheme for promotion beyond Clerical Grade I. The workman has relieved in 1986.
4. That the management has regularised Shri Bhaiyalal Yadav as Cashier as demanded by the Association.
5. That the management has promoted/regularised all the eligible employees from Grade II to Grade I and no dispute exists on this account.
6. That the management has promoted/regularised all eligible Clerks Grade III to Clerk, Gr. II and no dispute exists on this account.
7. That the Tub Writers have been regularised as per provisions of cadre Scheme and no dispute exists on this account as well.
8. That the management has paid to Shri G. S. Mehta, the sick leave wages and the grievances stands redressed.
9. That Shri D. P. Shrivastava has been provided with standard house and therefore no grievances/dispute exists on this account.

4. After the perusal of the terms of Settlement it is clear that the demands of the Staff Association as per aforesaid Appendix are fully satisfied and the settlement is just and proper. Consequently, the terms of Settlement are accepted and consent award in terms of the aforesaid settlement is hereby passed. Parties to bear their own costs.

ARVIND KUMAR AWASTHY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 नवम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3507.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ई. सी. एल. के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण जबलपुर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-11-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल - 21012/9/86 - डी - III (बी) / डी IV (बी)]
राजा लाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th November, 1994

S.O. 3507.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of E.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16-11-94.

[No. L-21012/9/86-DIII(B)/DIV(B)]

RAJA LAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

नई दिल्ली, 20 नवम्बर, 1994

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(210)/1987

BETWEEN

Shri D. S. Tiwari, represented through the General Secretary, M.P.K.K.M.P. Sohagpur Area, P.O. Dhanpuri, Shahdol (M.P.).

AND

The General Manager, Sohagpur Area of South Eastern Coalfields Ltd., District Shahdol (M.P.).

PRESENT :

Shri Arvind Kumar Awasthy, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For Workman : Shri S. K. Rao, Advocate.

For Management : Shri A. K. Shastri, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal Mine DISTRICT : Shahdol (M.P.)

AWARD :

Dated : November 7, 1994

This is a reference made by the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide Notification No. L-21012/9/86-D.III. B/DIV.B dated 27-10-1988 for adjudication of the following dispute :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Sohagpur Area of M/s. South Eastern Coalfields Ltd., Dhanpuri in denying promotion to Sri D. S. Tiwari to the Post of Senior Clerk in Clerical Special Grade when his juniors Shri Mohd. Umer Khan and S. C. Pal have already been promoted to the said post is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. The workman, Shri D.S. Tiwari has prayed for his promotion to Clerical Special Grade with effect from 16-11-84 and he has also prayed for all the arrears of wages along with the seniority and annual increment.

3. The contention of the workman is that he was promoted to the Clerical Grade II on 1-9-1974 and subsequently the management of Sohagpur Area of S.E.C.L. promoted him to Clerical Grade I with effect from 16-11-1981; the management has deliberately neglected to consider the applicant for the promotion of Clerical Special Grade and his juniors M.K. Chakraborty, Lal Singh, Mohd. Umer Khan and S.C. Pal were promoted to the said post of special Grade.

3. The management filed reply to the statement of claim of the workman and it was alleged that the case of Shri D.S. Tiwari cannot be compared with Shri M. K. Chakraborty, Lal Singh & Mohd. Umer Khan as they are from separate cadre scheme. The preliminary objection was raised by the management that the Ministry of Labour by order dated 16-10-1987 referred the dispute for adjudication. The reference was cancelled vide order dated 27-1-88 and as such the reference of the dispute already cancelled is beyond the scope and jurisdiction of the Government and it is liable to be rejected.

4. The workman expired and the counsel of workman, Shri S.K. Rao prays to pass a no dispute award.

5. I have gone through the documents filed by the parties and after the perusal of the statement of claim and the documents. I am of the opinion that the supersession of Shri D.S. Tiwari by his alleged juniors to the post of Senior Clerk of Special Grade was not unjustified because the cadre of the alleged juniors and the cadre of Shri D. S. Tripathi was governed by two separate cadre schemes.

6. Consequently, the reference is answered in favour of the management. Parties to bear their own costs.

ARVIND KUMAR AWASTHY, Presiding Officer

का. आ. 3508.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, महानदी कोलफील्ड्स लि. के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण भुवनेश्वर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 15-11-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/125/93-आईआर (सी-II)]

राजा लाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th November, 1994

S.O. 3508.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal Bhubaneswar as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Mahanadi Coalfields Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 15-11-1994.

[No. L-22012/125/93-IR-(CII)]

RAJA LAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, ORISSA, BHUBANESWAR

PRESENT:

Shri P. K. Tripathy, M.A. LLB., Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Orissa, Bhubaneswar.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE NO. 29 OF 1993 (Central)

Dated, Bhubaneswar, the 7th November, 1994

BETWEEN

The management of Deulbera Colliery of Mahanadi Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Deulbera, Dist. Dhenkanal.

.. First party—management.

AND

Their workman Smt. Chitra Behera represented through Orissa Coalfields Labour Union, P.O. Deulbera, Dist. Dhenkanal. .. Second party—workman.

APPEARANCES:

Sri R. S. Sharma, Dy. Personnel Manager—For the first party—management.

Sri T. Tigga, Vice-President of the Union.—For the second party—workman.

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of powers conferred upon it by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) have referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal vide their Order No. L-22012/125/93-IR(C.II) dated 23-8-83 :—

"Whether the action of the management of Deulbera Colliery, At P.O. Deulbera, Dist. Dhenkanal in not providing employment to Smt. Chitra Behera, W/o Late Kapila Behera, Ex-Mazdoor of Deulbera Colliery on the death of her husband prior to retirement is justified? If not, to what relief Smt. Chitra Behera is entitled to?"

2. This case had been posted to 22-10-94 for recording settlement. On that date the representatives of both the parties prayed to record the settlement arrived at between

them on 9-7-94 and to pass an award in terms thereof. On being asked, the workman Smt. Chitra Behera stated that she has already been provided with a job by the management. The terms of the settlement are read over and explained to the parties to which they admitted to be true and correct. The terms of the settlement being fair are recorded. Hence an Award is passed in terms of the settlement which do form part of the Award.

Dictated & corrected by me.

P. K. TRIPATHY, Presiding Officer

FORM—H

MEMORANDUM OF SETTLEMENT

Representing Employer :

- (1) Shri MVK Naidu, Project Officer, Deulbera Colliery.
- (2) Shri RK Katara, Personnel Manager, MCL, Talcher Area.

Representing Workman :

- (1) Smt. Chitra Behera.
- (2) Sri T. Tigga, Vice-President, O.C.L.U.

SHORT RECITAL OF THE CASE

Shri Kapila Behera was working as Mazdoor Cat-I and died on 15-05-1991. Thereafter his wife Smt. Chitra Behera (Widow) applied for appointment due to her husband's death under Clause 9.4.2 of N.C.W.A.-IV. The application form, on scrutiny was found improper. Some documents were required to be attached alongwith the application form. Smt. Chitra Behera submitted the documents on 03-09-1993 and her case for employment was processed for getting approval from Competent Authority of MCL Hq. Burla, Sambalpur. After receiving the competent approval she was offered appointment vide letter No. GM(T)/PD/9.4.2 of NCWA-IV/94/8765, dtd. 14-05-1994. She has paid all death/terminal dues of her husband. Smt. Chitra Behera has already joined in her duty at Central Hospital of M.C.L. Jagannath Area of Talcher Coalfields Ltd.

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

1. Smt. Chitra Behera has been appointed and being found medically fit by the Company's Medical Officer/Doctor, she has already joined her duty.

2. Smt. Behera will not claim any terminal benefits or what-so-ever.

3. The Industrial Dispute case pending before the Hon'ble Industrial Tribunal, Orissa, Bhubaneswar as I.D. Case No. 29/93(C) shall be disposed of as no dispute award and stands withdrawn in view of the settlement and copy of the settlement shall be filed thereof before the Hon'ble Industrial Tribunal.

RTI of Smt. Chitra Behera.

Sd/- Illegible

Signature of the Workman Signature of the Management
T. Tigga,

Sd/- Illegible

Witness of the Workman Witness of the Management.

Vice President
OCLU, Talcher
9-7-94

2734 GI/94-5

नई दिल्ली, 20 नवम्बर, 1994

का. आ 3509.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अन्तर्गत में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उच्च. सी. एल. के प्रत्यक्ष के संवद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच अन्तर्गत में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-11-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/193/91-आई आर (सी-II)]

राजा लाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th November, 1994

S.O. 3509.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of W.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16-11-94.

[No. L-22012/193/91/IR(C-II)]

RAJA LAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

CASE NO. CGIT/LC(R)(127)/1991

BETWEEN

Shri Durban Singh S/o Sukhan, represented through the Secretary, Sumyukta Kola Mazdoor Sangh, Post Chandametta, District Chhindwara (MP)-480447.

AND

The General Manager, Kanhan Area of W.C.L., Post Dungariya, District Chhindwara (MP)-480553.

PRESENT:

Shri Arvind Kumar Awasthy, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES:

For Workman : Shri P. K. Banerjee

For Management : Shri G. S. Kapoor.

INDUSTRY : Coal Mine DISTRICT : Chhindwara (MP).

AWARD

Dated, October 20, 1994

This is a reference made by the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-22012/193/91-IR(Coal-II) Dated 3-7-1991, for adjudication of the following dispute :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Western Coalfields Ltd., Kanhan Area in relation to their Rakhi Colliery in terminating/dismissing the services of Shri Durban Singh S/o Sukhan, Trammer w.e.f. 3-10-1989 is proportionate to the gravity of the offence and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. The workman and the management have not filed the statement of claim. Both the parties after the mutual discussion have agreed to withdraw the cases from the Tribunal. They have filed the terms and conditions of the settlement and they have prayed for passing no dispute award in terms of the settlement.

3. After the perusal of the terms and conditions of the settlement, no dispute award cannot be passed. However, the terms of the settlement are just and proper. They are accepted. Following are the terms and conditions of the settlement :—

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1. It is agreed by both the parties that the above six cases will be given for arbitration to Hon'ble Arbitrator Shri S. S. Mishra, Ex. Dy. CPM, WCL, Hqrs. and his decision will be final and binding on both the parties.
 2. It is agreed by both the parties that the Arbitrator will be requested to give the Award within 13 months and if necessary, will extend the time limit in consultation with both the parties.
 3. It is agreed by both the parties that this settlement will be filed before the CGIT, Jabalpur in above referred six cases, with a request to give No Dispute Award.
 4. This is full and final settlement in the said referred six cases and union and management will finalise the reference within a week time and submit the various authorities as per law.
4. Consequently, the reference is answered as per aforesaid terms of the settlement. Parties have agreed to enter into settlement as per decision of the Arbitrator. Shri S. S. Mishra, Ex. Dy. Chief Personnel Manager, Parties to bear their own costs.

ARVIND KUMAR AWASTHY, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 20 नवम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3510.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अन्तर्गण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इल्यू. सी. एल. के प्रबन्धन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 16-11-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/213/91-आईआर (सी-II)]

राजा लाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th November, 1994

S.O. 3510.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of W.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16-11-1994.

[No. L-22012/213/91-IR/C-II]

RAJA LAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (MP)

CASE NO. CGIT/LC(R)(138)/1991

BETWEEN

Shri Ramdayal S/o Umari, represented through the Secretary, Samyukta Koyla Mazdoor Sangh (AITUC), Post Chandametta, District Chhindwara (MP)-480447.

AND

The General Manager, W.C. Ltd., Kanhan Area, Post Dungaria, District Chhindwara (MP)-480553.

PRESENT:

Shri Arvind Kumar Awasthy, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For Workman : Shri P.K. Banerjee

For Management : Shri G.S. Kapoor, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal Mine DISTRICT : Chhindwara (MP).

AWARD

Dated, October 20, 1994

This is a reference made by the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Notification no. L-22012/213/91-IR(C-II) Dated 29-7-1991 for adjudication of the following dispute :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Western Coalfields Ltd., Kanhan Area in relation to their Rakhkol Colliery in terminating/dismissing the services of Shri Ramdayal S/o Umari, Trammer, w.e.f. 30-10-1989 is proportionate to the gravity of the offence and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. The workman and the management have not filed the statement of claim. Both the parties after the mutual discussions have agreed to withdraw the cases from the Tribunal. They have filed the terms and conditions of the settlement and they have prayed for passing no dispute award in terms of the settlement.

3. After the perusal of the terms and condition; of the settlement, no dispute award cannot be passed. However, the terms of the settlement are just and proper. They are accepted. Following are the terms and conditions of the settlement :—

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1. It is agreed by both the parties that the above six cases will be given for arbitration to Hon'ble Arbitrator, Shri S.S. Mishra, Ex. Dy. CPM, WCL, Hqrs. and his decision will be final and binding on both the parties.
2. It is agreed by both the parties that the Arbitrator will be requested to give the Award within 3 months and if necessary, will extend the time limit in consultation with both the parties.
3. It is agreed by both the parties that this settlement will be filed before the CGIT, Jabalpur in above referred six cases, with a request to give No Dispute Award.
4. This is full and final settlement in the said referred six cases and union and management will finalise the reference within a week time and submit the various authorities as per law.

4. Consequently by the reference is answered as per aforesaid terms of the settlement. Parties have agreed to enter into settlement as per decision of the Arbitrator, Shri S. S. Mishra, Ex. Dy. Chief Personnel Manager. Parties to bear their own costs.

ARVIND KUMAR AWASTHY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 नवम्बर, 1994

का.ग्रा. 3511.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ऐलैक्ट्रिकम्यूनिकेशन विभाग, करीम नगर के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में आरबिट्रेटर—श्री जे. कनक्या, Jt. CLC(C) नई दिल्ली के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 21-11-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40013/2/94-आई आर (डीयू)]
के. वी. बी. उण्णी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd November, 1994

S.O. 3511.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Arbitrator Shri J. Kanakiah, Jt. CLC (C), New Delhi as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Department of Telecommunication, Karimnagar and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 21-11-1994.

[No. L-40013/2/94-IR(DU)]
K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

Award in the Industrial Dispute between the Department of Telecommunications, Karimnagar Telecom District and their workman represented by All India Telecom Employees Union (Linestaff and Gr. 'D', Warangal area over alleged illegal termination of services of Shri N. Satyanarayana, Ex-casual Labour.

PRESENT:

On behalf of Department of Telecom:

1. Shri B. Gopal,
Telecom Dist. Engineer.
2. Shri K. Venkataratnam,
SDO, Phones, Peddapalli.
3. Shri Krishnamurthy,
JTO.
4. Shri M. Rajagopal Singh,
Sub-Divn. Engineer.

On behalf of Workman/Union:

1. Shri C. Suryanarayana,
President,
AITEU, (LS & Gr. D).
2. Shri A. Rajamouli,
Area Secretary,
AITEU, Warangal Area.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide Notification No. L-40013/2/94-IR(DU) dated 19-5-94 referred the Industrial dispute between the Telecom District Engineer, Karimnagar (hereinafter referred to as TDE for brevity) and All India Telecom Employees Union, Line Staff and Group 'D', Warangal Area (hereinafter referred to as 'Union' for brevity) regarding alleged illegal retrenchment of Shri N. Satyanarayana, Ex-casual labour for my arbitration.

Hearing in the above matter was held on 10-8-94, 14-8-94 at Hyderabad. Since the Arbitration proceedings could not be completed within three months from the date of reference

the parties in their letter dated 14-8-94 have agreed to extend the time limit for giving the Award by the Arbitrator by three more months. The next hearing in the matter was held on 26-10-94 at Hyderabad.

The only issue involved in the dispute is as to whether the TDE, Karimnagar had illegally retrenched the services of Shri Satyanarayana, ex-casual labour or not. The brief contentions of parties in the dispute are furnished hereunder:—

The TDE stated that Shri Satyanarayana worked as casual labour intermittently in the following months as per the verification certificate issued by the Accounts Officer, Office of Telecom District, Karimnagar.

Month	Year	W.O. No.	M.R. No.	No. of days
April	1982	27/82-83	414/20	26
September	1982	83/82-83	416/18	28
June	1982	26/82-83	424/15	26
January	1983	130/82-83	889/14	29
March	1983	140/82-83	297/8	29
April	1983	10/83-84	297/19	30
December	1983	166/83-84	122/2	31
January	1984	183/83-84	1272/19	23
February	1984	201/83-84	1273/12	29
March	1984	221/83-84	1274/6	27
April	1984	3/84-85	1274/23	30
May	1984	30/84-85	1873/3	31

It was further submitted that the records for the period 1980-81 are not available and it would not be possible to state whether Shri Satyanarayana worked during this period. According to TDE, Shri Satyanarayana had in fact worked upto May, 1984 although he mentioned in his original representation that he worked upto February, 1984 only. According to TDE, Shri Satyanarayana had not worked for 240 days in the preceding 12 calendar months of the day of termination of his service on 31-5-84. He further submitted that the Sub-Divisional Officer, Telephones (hereinafter referred to as SDO) had not terminated the services of Shri Satyanarayana but the employee himself left the service on his own accord and as such the termination of service can not be considered as retrenchment as defined under section 2(oo) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

The TDE also submitted that the industrial dispute in question has been raised 8 years after the alleged illegal retrenchment of the worker and the union had not furnished any reason for raising the dispute belatedly. In the circumstances explained above, the TDE submitted, that it would not be possible to reinstate Shri Satyanarayana in service either in accordance with the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act or Departmental Instructions, that too after about 10 years of the alleged termination of services.

The Union, on behalf of worker, filed the Muster Roll particulars of Shri Satyanarayana, Ex-casual labour (Exhibit-A1). The Union submitted that in accordance with the Muster Roll particulars, Shri Satyanarayana had put in 300 days attendance during the period from 1-1-84 to 31-12-84, the day on which his services were actually terminated. The union also filed the following documents:—

- (1) Copies of extracts from Swamy's Compilation of P&T financial Handbook, Vol. III, Part-I, (Exhibit-A2).
- (2) Copy of the DG, P&T Instruction No. 269-60/75-STB dated 16-9-75 regarding issue of Identity Cards to Mazdoor-methods to be followed etc. (Exhibit-A3).
- (3) DGP&T Order No. 269/130/78-STN dated 1-10-94 regarding notice of termination in respect of casual daily rated mazdoors in the P&T Department (Exhibit-A4).
- (4) Copy of the DGP&T Lr. No. 269-10/89-STN dated 7-11-89 addressed to the CGMs, Telecom Circles etc. regarding casual labourers (Grant of Temporary Status and Regularisation) Scheme-(Exhibit-A5).

(5) Identity Card and particulars of the Mazdoor duly certified by the SDOT (Exhibit-A6).

The Union pleaded that the termination of services of the employee would amount to retrenchment as defined under section 2(oo) of the Industrial Disputes Act as it is not one of the kinds of terminations mentioned therein. They further contended that the said retrenchment is illegal as TDE had not complied with the provisions of Section 25(F) of Industrial Disputes Act before terminating the services. The union therefore demanded reinstatement.

It was also contended that the workman would be entitled for temporary status in accordance with the instructions issued by the DGP&T. The Union added that the employee had not himself discontinued the service and there is no evidence to show that he left service on his own accord. Although he was willing to continue to work as casual labourer, the SDOT, Peddapalli failed to give him employment from 1-1-85 onwards. The Union therefore submitted that the termination of his service was not at the instance of the employee but at the instance of the employer. In support of the above contentions the Union invited attention of the decisions of the Supreme Court in the cases of (1) Santosh Gupta Vs. State Bank of Patiala (1980-3-SCC-82) and (2) State Bank of India Vs. N. Sundar Muni (1976-1-SCC-82) wherein it was held that retrenchment includes all kinds of termination of services by the employer for any reason whatsoever and not expressly included in section 2(oo) of Industrial Disputes Act.

As regards delay in raising the dispute, the Union submitted that the employee has been requesting the SDOT, Peddapalli to give him employment as casual labour in accordance with the instructions issued by the DGP&T and he was promised that his case would be examined and he would be taken as and when work was available for casual mazdoors. Although employment was given to many other casual mazdoors after 31-12-84, Shri Satyanarayana was not given any employment in spite of the instructions of Department of Telecom to give temporary status to those employees who have worked 240 days during the previous year. Since SDOT did not give any employment in spite of repeated requests Shri Satyanarayana had approached the Union and they have raised the dispute before the ALC (C) Mancherla. They have also submitted that there is no time limit prescribed for raising a dispute by the Employee/Union and on that ground alone the dispute cannot be treated as closed. The Union further requested to condone the delay, if any, in raising the dispute, as the employees is illiterate and belongs to a rural area.

The Union further submitted that the SDOT did not produce the records for the year 1980-81 on the plea that they are not available. The Muster Roll and Register of Muster Roll which are required to be maintained as per instructions of DGP&T have also not been produced by the SDOT. The verification which was reported to have been done by the authorities of Department of Telecom had not been done in the presence of the employee or the Union. In the absence of the records maintained by the SDOT, the Identity Card and the particulars of Muster Roll duly certified by the SDOT should be given due credit.

The TDE has submitted that the employee in his original representation/industrial dispute raised before the ALC (C) had mentioned that his services were terminated at the end of February, 1984. On verification of records maintained at the Office of SDOT, Peddapalli it was found that the employee had worked upto 31-5-94. From the records it was observed that the TDE found that Shri Satyanarayana had not put in 240 days attendance in any of the years from 82 to 84. All the required records such as Muster roll and Register of Muster rolls have been produced before the Arbitrator during the first hearing and the records for the year 1980-81 could not be produced as the same were not available. Since the Union and the employee have now furnished the particulars of the attendance from 1-6-84 to 31-12-84 the correctness of the Muster Rolls mentioned during the period from 1-6-84 to 31-12-84 requires verification. The TDE has sent a telegram on 4-11-84 stating therein that they have verified the records in the TDE office and found that the employee did not work as Mazdoor from June 1984 to December 1984.

The TDE further submitted that the statement made by the employee in his original representation dated 13-2-93 submitted before the ALC(C) Mancherla is false as he has stated that he became sick for a short period of about 2 months from February, 1984 and when he went back for employment he was not given any employment on the plea that there was not sufficient work for the casual mazdoors. The representative of the TDE further submitted that the employee had abandoned his service and SDOT had not terminated his services as alleged by the employee/union. Since the employee had not put in the required number of 240 days of attendance in any of the financial years (i.e. from 1st April to 31st March) the TDE is not required to give any termination notice nor offer him temporary status or absorb him in the regular service of TDE in accordance with the instructions of DGP&T as well as the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act. In support of his above contention the representative of the TDE filed a copy of the Award (Exhibit-D1) of the Award of Industrial Tribunal in the case between Shri J. Sudhakar Reddy Vs. SDOT, Warangal wherein it was held that the termination of Shri Reddy was found to be justified since he has not put in 240 days attendance in the preceding 12 months of termination of the service. He also filed a decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Ramgopal and others Vs. Union of India (Exhibit-D2) wherein it was held that, no distinction can be drawn between the petitioners as a class of employees i.e. who had joined after the cut-off date 30-3-85 and those who were joined before this cut-off date.

The Union submitted that Shri Satyanarayana has mentioned in his representation that his services were terminated in February 1984 as the records pertaining to the period from 1-1-84 to 31-12-84 were not available with him. Since the records were traced thereafter, during the period of hearing before the Arbitrator, the service particulars for the period from 1-1-84 to 31-12-84 have been produced. According to the Union the employee had put in 300 days attendance during the period from 1-1-84 to 31-12-84. They therefore submitted that the retrenchment is not only illegal but also violative of the instructions issued by the Department of Telecom from time to time and produced before the Arbitrator as Exhibits A1 to A6. The Union further submitted that the employee is prepared to accept the re-employment and would not press for either consequential benefits including back wages.

Shri Satyanarayana was examined on oath and he stated that he was working as casual labour from 1-1-79 to 31-12-84 in Warangal and Karimnagar divisions of Department of Telecom. Till February 1982 he was working in Warangal Division and thereafter in Karimnagar Division when Karimnagar division was bifurcated from Warangal Division. He worked under SDOT, Peddapalli upto 31-12-84. In support of the above, he filed a statement showing the particulars of the actual number of days he worked and a copy of the Department's Muster Roll (Exhibit-B1). As per Exhibit A1 he had put in 300 days attendance during the period from 1-1-84 to 31-12-84. He had also put in 285 days attendance from 1-6-80 to 31-5-81. He also filed the personal record of the employee with Muster Roll issued by the Accounts Officer, Telecommunications indicating the period he worked as casual mazdoor (Exhibit-B2). He also filed certificates issued by SDOT, Peddapalli, Junior Engineer, Phones; SDOT, Sub Divn. dated 7-4-82 SDO Telecom Peddapalli dated 21-2-84, SDOT, Warangal, Certificate dated 5-3-84, Sub-Inspector, Phones, Huzurabad who was the Mustering Officer for the period from 1-9-81 to 21-2-82.

He further submitted that by mistake he mentioned in his representation dated 13-2-93 that his services were terminated at the end of February, 1984 and thereafter he was not given employment in spite of repeated requests. On verification of the records found subsequently, it came to notice that he had worked upto 31-12-84. He, therefore, requested to take this service also on record for the purpose of this dispute. As regards the delay in raising the dispute he mentioned that he had approached the SDOT, Peddapalli repeatedly for giving him employment but he was not given employment on the plea that there was not sufficient work for the casual mazdoors. He further advised him to go to his native place and he would be intimated when work would be given to him. Since he had not received any communication for the last 8 years he raised the dispute before the ALC(C) Mancherla in February, 1993. He, there-

fore, requested to condone the delay and to correct the inadvertent mistake mentioned in the original application and treat the date of termination of service as 31-12-84 instead of 29-2-84. He further submitted that he is entitled for temporary status Mazdoor as per the departmental instructions as he had worked for 285 days during the period from 1-6-80 to 31-5-81 and 300 days during the period from 1-1-84 to 31-12-84.

From the above conflicting views of the parties the following issues arise for decision :—

- (1) Whether the employee/union is justified in raising the industrial dispute after 8 years of alleged termination of service;
- (2) Whether the termination of services of Shri N. Satyanarayana amounts to illegal retrenchment; if so, what relief he is entitled to?

(1) Delay in raising the dispute.—The employee undoubtedly raised the dispute before the Conciliation Officer i.e. ALC(C) Mancherial in February 1993. In the original representation dated 13-2-93 it was mentioned that he was illegally retrenched at the end of February, 1984. The management in their reply stated that the services were not terminated at the end of February 1984 but at the end of May, 1984. During the hearing held on 26-10-1994 the employee and the Union stated that the services of the employee were not actually terminated on 31-5-1984 but on 31-12-1984. Even if the date of termination of services is taken as 31-12-1984, as contended by the employee/Union, there has been a delay of more than 8 years in raising the industrial dispute. Although no specific time limit has been prescribed under the Act in raising the industrial dispute before the conciliation officer, it cannot be said that the dispute has been raised within a reasonable time. Obviously, there has been unduly long delay in raising the industrial dispute. The employee, however, submitted that the delay was because of the assurance given by the SDOT that he would be taken back into service as and when employment was available for casual mazdoors, he also mentioned that he had been requesting the authorities repeatedly for giving employment but could not get any response. After waiting patiently for about 8 years and having lost his hope, as a last resort, he raised the dispute before the ALC(C). Although the TDE contended the matter on the ground of undue delay, but they seriously contended the dispute on ground that the employee was not entitled for temporary status mazdoor as he had not put in one year continuous service i.e. 240 days attendance in any of the financial years. The employee is from rural background and not educated enough to know the legal implications in the matter. Besides that, no time limit is fixed for raising the dispute in the Industrial Dispute Act. The explanation given by the employee appears to be convincing. In another case referred to me for arbitration, the DOT authorities had re-employed Shri Gajanan and conferred temporary status in 1994 on satisfying the eligibility conditions as laid down in para (2) of DOT Letter No. 269-4/94-STN-II dated 17-12-1993. Thus there are cases where the delay has been condoned by DOT. Keeping these factors in view, the long delay in raising the industrial dispute can be understood and the same can be condoned. Accordingly the delay in raising the dispute by the employee/Union is hereby condoned.

(2) Whether the termination of service amounts to illegal retrenchment or not?—While the employee

had furnished a statement showing the musters put in by him from 1-1-79 to 31-12-84, supported by certificates issued by the concerned authorities, the management had furnished particulars of attendance for the months of April, June, September, 1982; January, March, April, December, 1983; and January to May, 1984. During this period the employee had put in 26 days to 31 days attendance in each month. The TDE did not produce any records for 1980-81 on the plea that they were not available. According to the certificate of Accounts Officer of Karimnagar Telecom District, the TDE says that the employee had not put in one year continuous service i.e. 240 days attendance in any of the financial years. They therefore contended that they are not required to comply with the provisions of sec. 25(F) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The employee/Union on the other hand says that he had put in 300 days attendance during the period from 1-1-84 to 31-12-84 and 285 days attendance during the period from 1-6-80 to 31-5-81. The TDE in his telegram dated 4-11-84 had confirmed that he had verified the records available in their office and found that Shri Satyanarayana had not worked during the period from 1-6-84 to 31-12-84. The representative of the union was also requested to verify the correctness of the muster roll particulars furnished by the employee along with the SDOT. But they did not submit any report till date. Since the TDE, Karimnagar has categorically stated that the employee did not work for the period from 1-6-84 to 31-12-84 after due verification of records, the statement of TDE can be relied upon. In the circumstances, it has to be concluded that Shri Satyanarayana had worked upto 31st May only and not put in 240 days attendance during the period from 1-1-84 to 31-12-84.

But it is observed that the employee had put in 285 days attendance during the period from 1-6-80 to 31-5-81. The muster roll particulars furnished in Exhibit-A1 are reproduced below :—

From	To	MR No.	No. of days	Unit	Name of LI SI/ MP/ JE/ SDOT
1-6-80	30-6-80	1919-21	25	JE	B. Narsimhulu
1-7-80	24-7-80	00000-84	22	S.I., Voli-mohammad	S.I.
1-8-80	24-8-80	00001-2	21		
1-9-80	30-7-80	21-77-14	24	V. Balaiah,	S.I.
1-10-80	30-10-80	NKB 21-77/12	26	Sayayad	S.I.
1-11-80	30-11-80	NKB-2178/24	24	Navab,	
1-12-80	31-12-80	2179-7	24	"	
1-1-81	31-1-81	NKB 2179/19	25	"	
1-1-81	28-2-81	NKB 21RD/9	24	"	
1-3-81	28-3-81	AD/406/5	24	"	
29-3-81	31-3-81	406/8	"	"	
1-4-81	30-4-81	AP/406/6	24	"	
1-5-81	31-5-81	AP/407	17	"	

Although the TDE did not agree with the number of attendance mentioned above by the employee the statement made by the employee is supported by the certificates issued by the concerned authorities. In these circumstances the inevitable conclusion would be that the employee had put in one year continuous service, i.e. more than 240 days attendance during the period from 1-6-1980 to 31-5-1981. The contention of the TDE that the employee had not put in 240 days in the financial year (i.e. from 1st April to 31st March) is not at all relevant. Section 25(B) defines the continuous service as under:—

- (1) A workman shall be said to be in continuous service for a period if he is, for that period, in uninterrupted service, including service which may be interrupted on account of sickness or authorised leave or an accident or a strike which is not illegal, or a lockout or a cessation of work which is not due to any fault on the part of the workman:
- (2) where a workman is not in continuous service within the meaning of clause (1) for a period of one year or six months, he shall be deemed to be in continuous service under an employer—
 - (a) for a period of one year, if the workman, during a period of twelve calendar months preceding the date with reference to which calculation is to be made, has actually worked under the employer for not less than—
 - (i) one hundred and ninety days in the case of a workman employed below ground in a mine; and
 - (ii) two hundred and forty days, in any other case;
 - (b) for a period of six months, if the workman, during a period of six calendar months preceding the date with reference to which calculation is to be made, has actually worked under the employer for not less than—
 - (i) ninety-five days, in the case of a workman employed below ground in a mine; and
 - (ii) one hundred and twenty days, in any other case.

Explanation.—For the purpose of clause (2), the number of days on which a workman has actually worked under an employer shall include the days on which—

- (i) he has been laid-off under an agreement or as permitted by standing orders made under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 (20 of 1946), or under this Act or under any other law applicable to the industrial establishment;
- (ii) he has been on leave with full wages, earned in the previous year;

(iii) he has been absent due to temporary disablement caused by accident arising out and in the course of his employment; and

(iv) in the case of a female, she has been on maternity leave; so however, that the total period of such maternity leave does not exceed twelve weeks”.

From the above it would be seen that the employee is deemed to have been put in one year continuous service if he had put in 240 days attendance during 12 calendar months and not in any accounting or financial year as contended by the TDE. In this case the employee had put in continuous service of more than one year i.e. 285 days, during the period from 1-6-1980 to 31-5-1981. In the absence of the records maintained by the employer for the year 1980-81, the employee's evidence cannot be brushed aside and has to be relied upon. In the absence of records, the benefit of doubt should be given to the employee concerned. The statement of the employee is also supported by the certificates issued by the concerned SDOTs and the TDE has not adduced any evidence to prove those documents as false. In view of the certificates issued by the authorities, I have no hesitation to hold that the employee had put in continuous service of one year during the period from 1-6-1980 to 31-5-1984. Since the employee had put in one year continuous service, the concerned authorities should not have terminated his services without complying with the provisions of section 25(F) of Industrial Disputes Act. In the circumstances, the termination of services have to be treated as illegal retrenchment of service.

The representative of the TDE also pleaded that the employee had abandoned the service on his own and they are not required to reinstate him in view of the fact that he has not put in continuous service of one year before the termination of service. The Supreme Court in the case of Santosh Gupta Vs. Bank of Patiala (1980-3-SCC-340) held that the retrenchment includes all kinds of termination of service by the employer for any reason whatsoever except those not expressly included in section 2(oo) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In the case of Mohan Lal Vs. Bharat Electronics (81-3-SCC-225) the Supreme Court held that termination simpliciter of services of a temporary workman, which does not fall within the excepted or excluded categories mentioned in section 2(oo) would amount of retrenchment. Termination of service on the ground of absence from duty for a long time would also amount to retrenchment as has been held by Supreme Court in 1 SCC 589-84. In the case of H. D. Singh Vs. RBI (85-4-SCC-201) Supreme Court held that the striking of a name of Tilka Mazdoor appointed for helping examiners of coins/notes from the Rolls would amount to retrenchment covered by section 25(F) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In the case of State Bank of India Vs. N. Sunder Muni (1976-1 SCC-82) the Supreme Court held that automatic termination of service on of contractual period amounts to retrenchment.

In view of the above decisions of the Supreme Court, the termination of services for any reason except those specifically mentioned in section 2(oo) would amount to retrenchment. In this case the employee was employed as casual mazdoor and he was not given employment after May, 1984. Since he has put in more than 240 days attendance in a period of 12 calendar months during the period from 1-6-1980 to 31-5-1981, the TDE ought to have complied with the provisions of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 before terminating the services of the employee. Besides that the departmental instructions also provide that the casual employees who have put in 240 days attendance should be given temporary status. In this case the TDE has not given him temporary status as the records available with him did not prove that he had put in 240 days attendance. For non-maintenance of records by the concerned SDO the employee cannot be deprived of his employment. The TDE ought to have verified the certificates issued by the concerned authorities and on the basis of the certificates issued by their own officers, he ought to have given temporary status to the employee. In the circumstances, the termination of service of Sri Satyanarayana amounts to illegal retrenchment as the employee had put in more than 240 days attendance and thereby one year continuous service as mentioned above. In case of illegal retrenchment the employees are required to be reinstated with full back wages and continuity of service. Keeping the delay in raising the dispute in view and the request of the union/employee, the Telecom District Engineer is hereby directed to give employment as Mazdoor and temporary status, as per directions given by the Department from time to time. In the circumstances, the employee would not be entitled for any other consequential benefits and back wages. Considering the above as fair and just I give my Award accordingly.

J. KANAKIAH, Jt. Chief Labour Commissioner
(Central) and Arbitrator.

नई दिल्ली, 23 नवम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3512 -- औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अन्वय में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, स. भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमि. की गन्डूह कोलियरी के प्रबन्धन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच अन्वय में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिनियम, (सं. 1) धनबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-11-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल 20012/ 26 /90-आई आर (कोल-I)]

एल 20012/27/90-आई आर (कोल -I)/
एल--20012 /28/90-आई आर (कोल -I)/
एल --20012 /37/90-आई आर (कोल -I)/
एल-20012 /30/90-आई आर (कोल -I)/
एल --20012 /79/91-आई आर (कोल -I)]

ब्रज मोहन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd November, 1994

S.O. 3512.--In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, (No. 1), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Ghandoodih Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 23rd November, 1994.

[No. L-20012/26/90-IR(Coal-I)/
L-20012/27/90-IR(Coal-I)/
L-20012/28/90-IR(Coal-I)/
L-20012/37/90-IR(Coal-I)/
L-20012/30/90-IR(Coal-I)/
L-20012/79/91-IR(Coal-I)]
BRAJ MOHAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of references under section 10(1)(d)(2-A) of
the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Reference No. 206 of 1990

(Ministry's Order No. L-20012(26)/90-IR(Coal-I) dt. 13-9-90)

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Ghanoodih
Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd.

AND

Their Workman (Ram Rup Chamar).

ANALOGOUSLY ALONGWITH

Reference No. 207 of 1990

(Ministry's Order No. L-20012(27)/90-IR(Coal-I) dt. 13-9-90)

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Ghanoodih
Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd.

AND

Their Workman (Sitaram Chamar).

Reference No. 208 of 1990

(Ministry's Order No. L-20012(28)/90-IR(Coal-I) dt. 13-9-90)

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Ghanoodih
Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd.

AND

Their Workman (Deo Nandan Gowala).

Reference No. 209 of 1990

(Ministry's Order No. L-20012(37)/90-IR(Coal-I) dt. 13-9-90)

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Ghanoodih
Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd.

AND

Their Workman (Rangilelal Jaiswara).

Reference No. 210 of 1990

(Ministry's Order No. L-20012(30)/89-IR(Coal-I) dt. 13-9-90)

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Ghanoodih Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd.

AND

Their Workman (Fauzdar Singh).

Referenre No. 15 of 1992

(Ministry's Order No. L 20012(79)/91-IR(Coal-I) dt. 'nil')

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Ghanoodih Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd.

AND

Their Workman (Sitaram Gwala).

PRESENT :

Shri P. K. Sinha, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri B. Joshi, Advorato.

For the Workman—Shri S. Paul, Advorote.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, the 16th November, 1994

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012(26)/90-I.R.(Coal-I), dated, the 13th September, 1990, relating to Reference No. 206 of 1990, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2-A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:

"Whether the action of the management of Ghanoodih Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. in dismissing Shri Ram Rup Chamar, Ex-Mining Sirdar is justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?"

2. In other five referenre cases mentioned above, which have been tried analogously alongwith Reference No. 206 of 1990, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has made similar references but in the name of individual workman who figured in that particular reference. Therefore, the reference orders in other cases are not being mentioned separately.

3. It will appear from the record Reference No. 206 of 1990 that by order dated 26th June, 1991 the learned predecessor Court had allowed the prayer to try all the aforesaid reference cases, except Reference No. 15 of 1992, analogously since genesis of the charge of misconduct in all the cases was the same. It will also appear from the record that a common domestic enquiry was held for these workmen.

4. It will also appear from the record that the sponsoring Union had, in its written statement, challenged against the fairness and propriety of the domestic enquiry conducted against these workmen. The learned predecessor Court took this issue as preliminary issue and passed an elaborate order dated 31st July, 1992, on this preliminary issue, relating to Reference Nos. 206 to 210 of 1990. Discussing all the points involved the learned predecessor came to the conclusion that the domestic enquiry against the workmen involved in the aforesaid reference cases was neither fair nor proper. The learned predecessor then allowed the management to adduce evidence on merit.

5. From the record it will further appear that the Reference No. 15 of 1992 was registered on 3rd February, 1992. In that case also the matter of fairness of domestic enquiry

was considered as preliminary issued and by order dated 6th November, 1992 in that case, the learned predecessor held that the domestic enquiry was not fair and proper. In that case also the management was allowed to adduce evidence.

6. From order dated 9th November, 1992 passed in Reference No. 206 of 1990 it will appear that from that date Reference No. 15 of 1992 was also tried analogously along-with Reference Nos. 206 to 210 of 1990. It may be mentioned that after passing of the order on preliminary issue, the management appears to have examined its first witness on 23rd November, 1992. Before order on the preliminary issue, the Enquiry Officer in these cases was examined as witness of the management, but he was not an eye witness to the incident which gave rise to the filing of the chargesheet against the concerned workman. Therefore, this order will dispose of all the aforesaid six reference cases. It may also be mentioned that before the order on the fairness of the domestic enquiry, the sponsoring Union had also examined one witness, namely, Sitaram Gowala.

7. In all the reference cases aforesaid, both the sides have filed their written statements which are similar in nature.

8. All the concerned workmen have been charged with taking part in a violent and riotous incident on 19th February, 1975 in which three persons were killed and several others were injured. The workman Deo Nandan Gowala (Reference No. 208/90) and Fauzdar Singh (Reference No. 210/90) were also charged with continuous absence thereafter, without permission and without sufficient cause. The charge-sheets are Exts. M-1, M-3, M-5, M-6 and M-8. The workmen also submitted their explanations in which they have denied the allegations.

9. It will appear from the record that for the aforesaid incident an F.I.R. was lodged against accused persons. The charge-sheets were issued in April/May, 1975. After the domestic enquiry the Enquiry Officer submitted his report on 24th February, 1976 (Ext. M-15). Ext. M-17 series are letters issued in August, 1976 containing orders for the dismissal of the concerned workmen.

10. The common defence of the workmen in their written statement is that they were active members of Rashtriya Colliery Mazdoor Sangh which had incurred the displeasure of the local leaders of the rival Union led by Shri S. K. Rai. Since the concerned workmen were enjoying respect from other workers, the rival Union Leaders were bent upon to falsely implicate them in order to get rid of them. Their charge is that the rival Union, with the help of anti-social element had deliberately created disturbance on 19th February, 1975.

11. In the written statement the management has disputed the claim of the concerned workmen and has claimed that in a fair enquiry the charge against the concerned workmen had been proved, hence, the management had correctly taken the action against the concerned workmen.

12. The point for consideration is as to whether or not in its evidence led before the Tribunal, the management has been able to prove the charges against the concerned workmen and, if so, whether the punishment awarded to the workmen was just and proper.

13. As already stated, the domestic enquiry having been held to be neither fair nor proper the management was afforded an opportunity to adduce evidence before the Tribunal in order to prove its case. The management examined six witnesses. As already stated, MW-1 Surendra Narayan Sinha, who was then Senior Personnel Officer, had conducted the enquiry and had submitted his enquiry report. Before the Tribunal he has not given his evidence as the eye-witness to the incident. His evidence related to the single point, as to whether or not the enquiry was fair and proper.

14. MW-2 was one Chandra Bhusan Singh who said that he knew all the concerned workmen. He supported that in February, 1975 an incident had taken place in the colliery at about 9.30 A.M. as a result of which Lalta Singh, Rajendra

Rai and Subhas Chandra Rai were killed and many others were injured. He also admitted that he had lodged F.I.R. with the police but said that it was written by the Police Officer on duty. During cross-examination he said that the Police Officer had not read over the F.I.R. to him. He said that he did not remember as to whether he had named the concerned workmen or their part in the incident, either before the Police Officer or before the Enquiry Officer. It will appear that this witness was declared hostile and the learned predecessor allowed him to be cross-examined by the learned counsel appearing for the management. His evidence in no way implicated any of the workmen. Similarly MW-3 Rabindra Nath Rai also supported the occurrence, but did not say anything about any of the concerned workman. He clearly said that he had not seen the concerned workmen as the members of the assembly that committed the offence. Similarly this witness was also declared hostile and was cross-examined on behalf of the management. He then said that he was asked to sign on a written statement which he had done. But he denied having said anything about the concerned workman in the domestic enquiry. He admitted, during cross-examination on behalf of the concerned workmen, that there was acrimonious trade union rivalry between R.C.M.S. and Janta Mazdoor Sangh in his colliery at that time, and one Union was trying to frame up the members of the other Union in false cases.

15. MW-4 is Bhagwan Das. He also did not support the case of the management and, similarly, was cross-examined on behalf of the management. He said that he did not remember as to whether he was a witness in the domestic enquiry, that he did not deny that he might have appeared as a witness in the domestic enquiry. During cross-examination by the concerned workmen he said that the mob was not visible to him from the place where he was at that time.

16. MW-5 is Bijay Shankar Rai who also did not support the case of the management. He said that he knew all the concerned workmen but he had not seen them in the mob on the date of incident. He also was declared hostile and was cross-examined on behalf of the management. He denied that in the domestic enquiry he had deposed and had identified the concerned workmen as members of the mob, variously armed. He also said that in the departmental enquiry nothing was recorded in his presence but he was given written sheets and was asked to sign on that, which he did. On being enquired by the Tribunal, the witness said that at the time of signing he had not read the statement. Those written sheets were brought to him by his fellow workers who said that the Union Leader Sri S. K. Rai wanted him to sign. At that he had signed over the documents.

17. MW-6 is Mahendra Prasad Dubey, who was appointed as management representative in the domestic enquiry. He has said as to how the domestic enquiry was ordered and as to how the statement of the witnesses were recorded by the Enquiry Officer. He submitted that out of 54 proceedings, sufficient evidence could be adduced by the management only against these six workmen. He submitted that the witnesses had said that the aforesaid six workmen were armed with guns and pistols at the time of occurrence. Therefore this witness also is not an eye witness.

18. Against that, four of the concerned workmen have examined themselves as WW-1 to WW-4, namely, Deo Nandan Gowala, Fauzdar Singh, Ram Rup Chamar and Rangilelal Jaiswara. They all have denied their participation in any incident claiming that they were implicated because they were members of the R.C.M.S. in which capacity they used to raise demand of the workmen. There is nothing significant in their cross-examination.

19. This is all the evidence on the record.

20. When it has been declared that the domestic enquiry was not fair and proper, then for deciding as to whether or not the management has proved the charges against the concerned workmen, the evidence adduced in that domestic enquiry cannot be looked into. In such a circumstances the management is given an opportunity to prove by evidence in the Tribunal the charges levelled against the workmen

which was done in this case. From the evidence adduced on behalf of the management it is clear that none of the witnesses produced by the management, as eye witness, have supported the management's case to any extent. There is nothing in their evidence to implicate the concerned workmen.

21. Under the circumstance it must be held that the management has failed to prove its charges against any of the aforesaid workmen. This being so, I must also hold that the action of the management in dismissing the aforesaid six workmen was not justified.

22. Having decided this point the next question that would arise would be the relief to which these workmen are entitled.

23. Evidently the alleged incident had taken place in February, 1975 and the charge-sheets were issued in April/May, 1975. The domestic enquiry was concluded when the Enquiry Officer submitted his enquiry report dated 24-2-1976. In August, 1976 the management had issued the orders of dismissal of the aforesaid six concerned workmen. But it will appear that the reference in this case was made by the Central Government, in the Ministry of Labour, so far Reference Nos. 206 to 210 of 1990 are concerned in the year 1990. In so far Sitaram Gwala (Ref. 15 of 1992) was concerned the reference was made in the year 1992. What has to be seen is as to who is responsible for this delay and the implication of such delay.

24. In their written statement filed on behalf of the workmen a plea has been taken that the workmen were given to understand that the matter was being pursued by the R.C.M.S. but when they lastly found that their cases were not being properly represented by the union, they gave up the Union and raised the dispute themselves.

25. Certain documents in this regard are relevant. Ext. W-2, filed on behalf of the workmen is a letter issued by the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour dated 8-2-78, to the General Manager of the concerned colliery as well the Secretary of the R.C.M.S. relating to the dispute raised by the Union. This letter is in continuation of the Ministry's earlier letter dated 12-4-77. This letter informed the Secretary of the Union that the Government of India had decided not to refer the dispute to an Industrial Tribunal for adjudication as prima facie there was no case for reference for the reason that the workmen had been dismissed on the basis of the findings of a duly constituted and properly conducted enquiry in which they had fully participated. It will further appear from Ext. M-18 that the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Patna, at Ranchi Bench by order dated 16-4-86 passed in CWJC No. 1037/84(R) had also observed that the Government of India had refused to refer the case on 12-4-77. This 12-4-77 is the date mentioned in Ext. W-2 also as already seen. Therefore, the concerned workmen must be taken to have come to know, for the first time, in the year 1977 itself that the Government of India had refused to make a reference. From Ext. W-1 it will appear that the concerned Union, R.C.M.S., by its letter dated 25-10-76 had raised dispute relating to these six workmen for the first time.

26. There is nothing on the record to show as to why the workmen had not raised the dispute within a reasonable time after the year 1977 when then came to know that the Ministry had refused to make any reference. The concerned workmen were entitled to do so under the provision of Section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Indeed, it was under this provision that they eventually raised dispute after passing of the aforesaid order by the Hon'ble High Court. The order of the Hon'ble High Court in Ext. M-18, dated 16-4-86 is as follows :

"The petitioners were dismissed way back in 1976. Later the respondents No. 1 refused to make reference on 12-4-77. We are unable to see how after a period of nearly nine years the present writ petition can be entertained, which is belated. It is accordingly dismissed in limine."

It may be noted here that the aforesaid writ application was filed by the workman, namely, Rangilelal Jaiswara and others. This Rangilelal Jaiswara is a witness on behalf of the

workmen (WW-4) who has said in the cross-examination that he was Asstt. Secretary of R.C.M.S. Their written statement also mentions that they were active members of R.C.M.S. Then when in the year 1977 the Central Government refused to make a reference, it could hardly be said that they were not aware of this order.

27. I have been told by the learned lawyers that on passing of the aforesaid order by the Hon'ble High Court the workmen themselves had raised individual disputes before the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (Central) at Dhanbad. In this regard the reference orders in Reference Nos. 206 to 210 of 1990 may be seen in their last portion through which the copies of the reference orders were sent to different officials. From the endorsement made to the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C), Dhanbad it will appear that the said official had submitted his failure report to the Ministry in January, 1990, from the File No. given therein it will appear that those were opened in the year 1989. Therefore, in those cases obviously the individual workman had raised these disputes themselves in the year 1989.

28. From similar observation of Reference order No. 15 of 1992, from the File No., it will appear that the dispute was raised in the year 1990, and the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (Central), Dhanbad had submitted his failure report on 24-4-1991.

29. I have no hesitation in holding that in all these cases the workmen were themselves responsible for the delay in the reference. After the year 1977 they waited till the year 1984 to file the aforesaid writ application which was disposed of by order of the Hon'ble High Court dated 16-4-86. Thereafter also the workmen slept over the matter and again raised disputes themselves sometime in the year 1989.

30. For the aforesaid reasons I don't think that this is fit case in which payment of back wages should also be ordered. But in view of failure by the management to prove the charge against these workmen in its evidence adduced in the Tribunal, the workmen concerned are entitled to their reinstatement in the service. This is the only relief they are entitled to.

31. Following, therefore, is the award :—

The management of Ghansodih Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. was not justified in dismissing Ram Rup Chamar (Reference No. 206 of 1990), Sitaram Chamar (Reference No. 207 of 1990), Doe Nandan Gowala (Reference No. 208 of 1990), Rangilelal Miswara (Reference No. 209 of 1990), Fauzdar Singh (Reference No. 210 of 1990) and Sitaram Gowala (Reference No. 15 of 1992) from service. These workmen are entitled only to reinstatement to the post they were holding prior to their dismissal, immediately on this award becoming enforceable, their own cost.

Under the circumstance of the case the parties shall bear their own cost.

32. This disposes of all the aforesaid six reference cases.

P. K. SINHA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 नवम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3513.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के पन्तराज में केन्द्रीय सरकार सेन्ट्रल इन्स्टीट्यूट फॉर रिसर्च आन्ड वॉफेलोज के प्रबन्धन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अन्तर्बन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचपद को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 22/11/94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एन-42012/112/91 आई आर (जीयू)]

के. वी. बी. उन्नी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd November, 1994

S.O. 3513.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Central Institute for Research on buffaloes and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 22-11-1994.

[No. L-42012/112/91-IR(DU)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI M. S. SULLAR, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

Case No. I.D. 100/92

Raghubir Singh Vs. Central Instt. for Research on Buffaloes.

For the workman.—Shri Darshan Singh.

For the management.—Shri N. K. Suneja.

AWARD

Dated the 4th November, 1994

In the wake of Industrial Disputes, raised by the workman, Central Govt. vide L-42012/112/91-IR(DU) dated 20-8-1992 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the action of the management of Central Institute for Research on Buffaloes, Hissar in terminating the services of Shri Raghubir Singh w.e.f. February 1989 is justified? If not, what relief the workman concerned is entitled to?”

The matrix of the facts, culminating in the commencement of present reference, are that Raghubir Singh, workman was appointed as Chowkidar, by the management, in the month of April, 1988. Services of the workman were terminated w.e.f. February 1989 by the Management. He has challenged his termination order by way of present reference. The case set up by the workman, in brief, in so far as relevant is that, his services were illegally terminated by the Management, although he has completed 240 days of his service and he is entitled for all the benefits permissible under Industrial Dispute Act.

2. According to the Management, the workman was employed on daily wages for doing work. He was not posted on a particular post. He has not completed 240 days of his service in a calendar year. It is alleged that the workman had himself abandoned the job and he is not entitled for any benefit. That being so, the management prayed for the dismissal of present petition.

3. The Management filed the written statement on 13-10-1993. The case was slated for 3-2-1994 by Shri Arvind Kumar, the then Learned Presiding Officer. On that day, the affidavit was not filed by the workman. Adjournment was requested and the case was adjourned to 17-5-1994 for filing the affidavit. On that day also, the position remains the same. Another adjournment was requested and case was adjourned to 29-7-1994, and from 29-7-1994, the case was adjourned to 5-10-94, for filing the affidavit by the workman. The workman again did not file the affidavit. In place of filing the affidavit, the Rep. of the workman has made the following statement.

"I am authorised Rep. of the Workman. I do not press the reference petition which may be decline."

4. As indicated earlier, more than sufficient opportunities have already been granted to the workman to substantiate his claim, but he failed to do so. In other words, he has nothing to support his case, particularly, when the management has stoutly denied his claim.

5. In this view of the matter, and in view of the statement of the Rep. of the workman, the reference is hereby declined. Appropriate Govt. be informed accordingly.

Chandigarh.

Dated : 4-11-1994.

M. S. SULLAR, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 23 नवम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3514.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अन्वय में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स. भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमि. का भुरुंगिया प्रोजेक्ट महुदा एरिया नं.-2 के प्रबन्धन के संवेदन नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अन्वय में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (सं.-1) धनवाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 23-11-94 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-20012/32/89 आई आर (कोल-I)]
ब्रज मोहन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 23rd November, 1994

S.O. 3514.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, (No. 1), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bhurungiya Project in Mahuda Area No. II of M/s. BCCL and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 23-11-1994

[No. L-20012/32/89-IR(Coal-I)]
BRAJ MOHAN, Desk Officer.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NO. I, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) (2-A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Reference No. 134 of 1989

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., in relation to Bhurungiya Project in Mohuda Area No. II.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Shri P. K. Sinha, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers.—Shri G. Prasad, Advocate.

For the Workmen.—Shri D. Mukherjee, Secretary, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dated, the 10th November, 1994

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012/32/89-I.R. (Coal-I) dated, the 3rd November, 1989, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2-A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

"Whether the Management of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., in relation to Bhurungiya Project in Mohuda Area No. II is justified in effecting change in the job of the 28 workmen w.e.f. 17-12-1987 from Miner Loader to different time-rate jobs carrying lesser wage rates? If not to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to?"

2. It appears from the order dated 8-11-1994 that Sri G. Prasad, learned Counsel appearing for the management, had filed a petition stating therein that as per terms of reference, the demand for regularisation of miner/loaders (concerned workmen), working in different time-rated categories, had been fulfilled and they have since been regularised in respect of jobs and their wages have been fixed after protecting their group wages. The management has also filed documents in support of this. A prayer was made to pass an award accordingly.

3. Sri Prasad moving the application submitted that whatever change in the jobs of 28 workmen with effect from 17-12-1987 from miner/loader to different time-rated jobs carrying lesser wage rates was effected, the loss in wages to the workmen have been rectified by the management as per chart sub-

mitted by the management on 14-6-1994. He submitted that not only the workmen have been regularised in their new jobs, but they also have been given wage protection by the management.

4. Sri D. Mukherjee, appearing on behalf of the sponsoring Union, after going through the application and the documents filed by the management earlier, submitted that he has no objection if an award is rendered in terms of the admission made by the learned Counsel for the management. Both sides agreed that an award be rendered in following terms :

"The management of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd., in relation to Bhurungia Project in Mohuda Area-II, in effecting change in the job of 28 workmen with effect from 17-12-1987 from miner/loader to different time-rated jobs carrying lesser wage rate, was not justified. The concerned workmen are entitled to wage protection in their changed jobs."

5. Since, as per submission of the management, the wage protection has already been given to the concerned workmen, there is no further need to pass any order about the relief to be granted to the concerned workmen.

6. In view of the above, the award is rendered in the aforesaid terms.

P. K. SINHA, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 24 नवम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3515—केन्द्रीय सरकार इसमें संतुष्ट है कि लोकहित में यह अपेक्षित है कि उद्योग, भारत सरकार टकमाल, कलकत्ता जो कि औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की प्रथम अनुसूची में प्रविष्टि द्वारा शामिल है, को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजन के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित किया जाना चाहिए,

अतः अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (ड) के उप खण्ड (VI) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय-II सरकार उक्त उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए तत्काल प्रभाव से छह मास की कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित करती है।

[फा. सं. एम -11017 /6/85-डी-1(ए)]

एस. एस. पराशर, अव्वर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th November, 1994

S.O. 3515.—Whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the public interest requires that the industry, India Government Mint, Calcutta, which is covered by entry 11 in the First Schedule to the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), should be declared to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act;

Now, therefore, exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (vi) of the clause (n) of Section 2 of

the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby declares with immediate effect the said industry to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act for a period of six months.

[No. S-11017/6/85-D.I.(A)]

S. S. PRASHER, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 दिसम्बर, 1994

का. आ. 3516—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि लोकहित में ऐसा करना अपेक्षित था, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 15) की धारा 2 के खंड (ड) के उपखंड (VI) के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 1403 दिनांक 1 जून, 1994 द्वारा लौह अयस्क आयोग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 8 जून 1994 से छः मास की कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित किया था:

और केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोकहित में उक्त कालावधि को छः मास की और कालावधि के लिए बढ़ाया जाना अपेक्षित है।

अतः अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खंड (घ) के उपखंड (VI) के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 8 दिसम्बर, 1994 से छः मास की और कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित करती है।

[संख्या एम -11017 /12/85 डी -1 (ए)]

एस. एस. पराशर, अव्वर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th December, 1994

S.O. 3516.—Whereas the Central Government having been satisfied that the public interest so required had, in pursuance of provisions of sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of Section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), declared by the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour S.O. No 1403 dated the 1st June, 1994, the iron ore mining industry to be public utility service for the purposes of the said Act, for a period of six months, from the 8th June, 1994;

And, whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that public interest requires the extension of the said period by a further period of six months;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of Section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act, for a further period of six months from the 8th December, 1994.

[No. S-11017/12/85-D.I.(A)]

S. S. PRASHER, Under Secy.